MINUTES OF ORAL EVIDENCE
taken before the

HIGH SPEED RAIL BILL COMMITTEE

on the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS – CREWE) BILL

Tuesday 15 May 2018 (Afternoon)

In Committee Room 5

PRESENT:

James Duddridge (Chair)
Sandy Martin
Mrs Sheryll Murray
Martin Whitfield
Bill Wiggin

__________

IN ATTENDANCE:

Timothy Mould QC, Lead Counsel, Department for Transport

__________

WITNESSES:

Bryan Fletcher (Stone Rural Parish Council)
David Cook (Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council)
Jeremy Lefroy MP
Rupert Thornely-Taylor, Acoustics and Vibration Expert (HS2 Ltd)
Peter Miller, Head of Environment and Planning, HS2 Ltd

IN PUBLIC SESSION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stone Rural Parish Council</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissions by Mr Fletcher</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response by Mr Mould</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>David Cook/Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissions by Mr Cook</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Mr Thornely-Taylor</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Mr Miller</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. THE CHAIR: Mr Fletcher, welcome.

2. MR FLETCHER: Thank you very much.


4. MR FLETCHER: That is correct.

5. THE CHAIR: Over to you, sir.

Stone Rural Parish Council

Submissions by Mr Fletcher

6. MR FLETCHER: Thank you very much and good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, and thank you for saying a representative from Stone Rural Parish Council. I am the chairman of Stone Rural Parish Council. We are a council of four small communities, but only 1,500 folk. More sheep and cows than folk in Stone rural. We have a very simple petition as no doubt you’ve seen. I hope we won’t spend as long on it as you’ve had to this morning.

7. THE CHAIR: Bless you.

8. MR FLETCHER: Any time that any proposal comes up within the parish area, I am finding that folk are most concerned about extra traffic that any development brings with it, and so you will notice that our petition, in fact, majors on that very fact of heavy goods vehicles that might come to the area. Of course, heavy goods vehicles bring with them pollution, congestion and danger to other pedestrians and other road users.

9. On the environmental statement maps, which were produced by HS2, there were a number of green broken lines shown on highways around the maps covered, and these were of immediate concern to members of the parish council because they showed, in fact, where construction traffic was going to go in order to serve the HS2 works. The question that arose with us was, ‘What is construction traffic?’ And I have assumed, being a civil engineer of some years that the sorts of vehicles I would expect HGVs to be, in construction mode, would be four axle rigid vehicles carrying sand, cement, concrete and all the other things. They are particularly slow vehicles very often and
produce, or appear to produce, a lot of fumes and slow movement and so on and so forth.

10. I have noticed in HS2 documentation that the expression LGV is used. It’s not one that I have come across, I’m sorry to say, so I don’t know what the difference between LGV and an HGV is. But it doesn’t matter. If it’s a large goods vehicle, I’m sure it’s the same as a heavy goods vehicle or at least it’ll be similar.

11. In fact, as far as the parish council is concerned, we simply request that HGVs and LGVs do not use the local roads, but use the M6 at the railhead, the proposed railhead, and then use internal haul ways within the site. Not everywhere in the proposals have I found the numbers of HGV vehicles that are intended to use the roads are mentioned. There are some, but not everywhere.

12. I see that you’ve already got the one plan that I would refer to in front of you on the screens, and this, in fact, is the one which is probably best. So, let’s take each of the roads in turn that I have mentioned in the petition.

13. First of all, Pirehill Lane. Now Pirehill Lane starts at the roundabout in Stone, just here, and it comes down here and then comes down through a housing residential development. Now, I am pointing there within Stone town parish, not within Stone rural, but as you will understand, it really is relevant. I should mention that Pirehill Lane here, from this junction here all the way through to there is in a residential estate. This is Pirehill Lane. This is where cars are parks either side of the road all day and you have to weave amongst them in order to get through in the normal course of events. And so putting HGV vehicles on that road will, in my opinion, be disadvantageous and also be a great problem to those using it. There are shops on that road there, and there’s a school just here, and so the school traffic on Pirehill Lane, that’s mums fetching and carrying children that start and finish school, and also a lot of them have got to walk home and have to cross Pirehill Lane or use the footways.

14. But the main part, of course, that concerns the Stone Rural Parish Council is from here through to here. Now, that there, we all know it in Stone as Pirehill Lane, but it actually is what we call a ‘BOAT’. I’m sure you’ve come across BOATs – byways open to all traffic. Now this particular one, I would say, immediately to all those present in this room, would you like to live up that road and have to go across it to get out to
work every day? And I suspect that nobody is going to say anything in this room because it is a dreadful road. It is absolutely unsuitable for almost all traffic. You’re alright with a tractor and trailer, but for cars, it is not advisable to use that road. And so, therefore, if it was intended by HS2 to use it for heavy goods vehicles, it would not take very long to destroy what surface there is.

15. The surface is, generally speaking, loose stone. It’s unbound stone and so therefore unsuitable really for any traffic at all, and in wet weather, with heavy vehicles, it will be twice as bad, if not three times as bad. So, that’s Pirehill Lane for you, which goes from there, which is Pirehill Lane, all the way to the site of where, in fact, access is actually stated to go to, which I think is one of the satellite compounds that are being proposed.

16. Then there’s Eccleshall Road. Now Eccleshall Road, again, it starts here at the Walton roundabout, and goes down here and across here. Now, most of that road, as you can see from this plan, is actually in Stone Town Parish Council. I’m quite sure that if they haven’t already said so, they’ll be telling you all about that, but I can tell you it passes a parade of shops here, shops either side. It’s got pedestrian crossings and all sorts of things, businesses, there’s a vet’s there, and there’s new residential development starting here, and new residential development starting here. Now that particular area is all residential and really not suitable, I would suggest, for heavy goods vehicles at all. The bit that’s in Stone rural, from here down to your site, really, it would work alright. There wouldn’t be a problem, but it’s really the bit that goes through Stone town that I want to draw your attention to. That’s if Stone Town Parish Council haven’t already done so.

17. Then we move over a little further north to Yarnfield Lane. Now, Yarnfield Lane is now, I think, famous to this Committee. I’m quite sure it’s a problem that started the very first time that we ever heard about HS2 because it was intended that, in fact, Yarnfield Lane be closed, and everybody in the room that I was in at the time that was announced was up in arms straightaway. Fortunately, HS2 have now said that they will not close it permanently. It will be open with very restricted closure.

18. On there, it’s stated in the documents, the 436 movements of heavy goods vehicles would go on Yarnfield Lane. Now whilst I agree that’s a maximum, it’s also an average
and so if you reduce that to however many an hour it would be, which might be one every 30 to 40 seconds – averages are more and averages are less – there could be a number of vehicles in any one minute travelling on Yarnfield Lane when you work out that 436 are likely at an average to go over there every day.

19. This is a narrow carriageway. It has a T junction with the A34 just here, which I understand from just recent days, it is intended to signalise. That is following a meeting and agreement and undertaking that HS2 have had with the county council, who are, of course, the highway authority for all the roads in the county.

20. Also, on Yarnfield Lane, you’ve got a steep gradient and a double bend just here. There’s very poor visibility there, and the environmental plan shows that some work is intended by HS2 to be done there, but I’m afraid I’m not quite clear what the work is, and I suspect that it might be taking down trees in order to improve visibility, which, on the face of it, is sensible. But if there’s anything done to the carriageway, then it’s going to increase the gradient if, in fact, those bends are eased out or moved. There are two bends there with a gradient. Agreed, HS2 intend to do something, but I would like to see more detail of it later when detailed drawings come out before saying that I think it’s a good idea or not because any straightening of the road will increase the gradient even more.

21. This Yarnfield Lane is busy during peak hours. Folk from Yarnfield here, and Swynnerton up here, in fact, use it to get to work. Because now we are in the position whereby a number of additional residential areas are being developed in Yarnfield and Swynnerton and at busy times of the day, you find that there’s a lot of traffic waiting at Yarnfield Lane junction there to get on to the A34 to go north or south; north, Stoke-on-Trent; south, to Stafford and Birmingham. So it’s very busy there at those times of day.

22. That’s Yarnfield Lane. Then I also objected to the use of the A51. Now, the A51 starts here at the roundabout here, which is Meaford roundabout. That’s Meaford. You’ve seen it written on the maps, M-E-A-F-O-R-D. Just forget the ‘a’. It’s Mef-ford, not Mee-ford, and the A51 goes straight here.

23. Now, on the face of it, the A51 actually, you can’t argue that that can’t be used by a reasonable number of heavy goods vehicles. It’s not really a serious problem. However, there is another of these famous BOATs, which is, in this case, BOAT 34,
which runs from a junction there and then comes over here and goes all the way to serve, I think, another satellite compound on HS2. Now, that boat there is in even worse condition than the one I mentioned at Pirehill Lane. Quite frankly, it’s described as a byway into all traffic and I would just say, it’s a byway unsuitable for all traffic.

24. I don’t know whether anybody in here has actually visited it, but I have driven over it, and I didn’t want to take my car there again. So, that’s the state of it, to be quite honest with you. It’s understood actually that there isn’t going to be too much development there except that it will be a permanent connection to HS2 in the future. I’m not quite sure exactly why it is, but having read the document, I understand that it’s going to be improved and to a width of 3.7 metres, which if fine. But it is quite a long way. I would think it’s an expensive job because it’s a full construction job. It’s not just a case of putting down some tarmac and rolling it. It would have to be a full construction job to bring that up to scratch. But in order to use it for any HGV use, quite frankly, from the start of the work, I believe that would have to be done immediately, before you put any HGVs on it to use the road. You would have to use HGVs to construct it, but after that, to use it at all, I think, would be very difficult.

25. And as I have said, the A51 from here, all the way across to here, within the parish boundaries, this actually has been recently regarded and publicised in the press as dangerous since motorcyclists find the alignment an ‘exciting ride’. So it’s not a road that really needs to have much more traffic on it in order to maintain its safety. It’s the A51 all the way from the roundabout here, all the way up to Nantwich, way out into Cheshire. So there is a certain part here; some of these bends are actually quite interesting and exciting, I think, for those who drive motorcycles. And so you just don’t know when you’re going to get somebody who is perhaps exceeding the speed limit. They may not be doing the right thing down there. If we put heavy goods vehicles on there – more heavy goods vehicles, because there are some – more heavy goods vehicles, I don’t think that would be a good idea.

26. Now, those are all the matters that I raised for roads within the parish council at the time of writing the petition. But last week, it came to my notice that, in fact, a drawing had been produced for the A51 down here, along that red line there, and this junction here, which we call Aston roundabout. I don’t think it’s been called that; it’s been called Brooms roundabout in the correspondence. But in fact, there will be a mass
haul route. It will come up the A34 here, come to this roundabout, and then go down the A51 and away. I don’t know where it goes to, but it does therefore come into our parish and it’s been stated that there are 1,200 vehicle movements per day. Again, maximum, I agree, and an average. The county council have provisionally agreed – the thing is I’ve only seen this just before the end of last week – a dedicated left turn at the roundabout here. Now, that’s fine for traffic going to HS2 along the A51, and then down the A34, but what about the traffic going back again? Because that roundabout, it’s a big roundabout, with a number of right turners, and if you put a number more, half of 1,200 more per day on there, then the right turn there is going to be horrendous. It’s going to clog up the roundabout more than you can imagine. So, a dedicated left turn there, which has been proposed. I don’t know whether the county council have accepted it from HS2, but this here is an area which wasn’t shown on the original environment drawings with the green dotted line to which I have referred. So, my question is, at this stage, what’s this all about, really?

27. The A34, on the whole, we haven’t really complained about the use of the A34 for HGVs. The A34 is an ex trunk road. I think it was described this morning as a trunk road. It was de-trunked 20 years ago, so it’s now a county road, but it is a dual carriageway and it’s perfectly adequate for HGV traffic and indeed increasing HGV traffic over a short period; the period of time that would be needed for HS2. But the problem is the junctions on it. We’ve just talked about this junction here. Between here, all the way through Stone, and up to this A51, there are six roundabouts; one signal control junction, nine T junctions. So, it’s all very well saying that the A34 is capable of carrying, as a dual carriageway, additional HGV traffic, but at every junction, you’re going to get slowing down and accelerating heavy goods vehicles all the way through the town and out through the other end. So, although it’s adequate as a dual carriageway to carry out all the traffic, I don’t believe it’s the right thing to encourage more HGVs to use all the junctions on that road.

28. Much of all this that I’ve just talked about, it could be solved by advanced construction of the M6 slip roads at the railhead, i.e. before 2021. This is a matter that I’ve talked to one or two folk about and it seems to me that whilst Highways England and HS2 might not be inclined to discuss the work being carried out by Highways England, surely common sense demands that the M6 slip roads to the railhead are built
by Highways England during their work on the M6, which has just started. Now, this work is for the smart carriageway between Junction 13 and Junction 15, and has, as has already been stated today, already started.

29. It seems to me that the sensible thing to do here would be to construct and have the highways contractor for Highways England construct those slip roads in advance. Now, there are political, procedural and possibly financial reasons why that should not happen, but I can’t see why it isn’t within the realms of common sense that we shouldn’t be able to at least talk about this and put those slip roads to the railhead as soon as possible.

30. I really ask the question, is this a matter for this committee to approach the minister to, I won’t say bang heads together, but to get folk together and to see whether those slip roads for the railhead are in fact constructed in advance of HS2 works in order to alleviate much of the work that needs to be done along these roads that I have described that we need to keep the HGVs from. Particularly, I’m talking about Yarnfield Lane of course. And I still believe, on the end of my petition that I prepared for the parish council, that the northbound slip road to the railhead could be retained for the IMB-R, or will it be possible for the IMB-R to use the northbound temporary access off the motorway in the future because at Yarnfield Lane, there is an existing emergency access to the motorway, which is used for emergency vehicles only at this time, and it will be maintained, of course, after HS2 is completed.

31. In my petition, I also mentioned that the existing Yarnfield Lane bridge could be retained. I’m prepared to remove that. I don’t think that’s necessary now, so I wouldn’t continue to discuss that. That, basically, is all I wish to say, sir.

32. THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. No-one’s catching my eye for questions. Mr Mould?

   **Response by Mr Mould**

33. MR MOULD QC (DfT): The petitioner has put forward a solution to keeping as much traffic off the roads for Stone as is possible, and that solution, I’ve explained, can’t be done. But what I will do is just to remind you of some of the other solutions that we have set in train through assurances given to the county council and then just
show you the logic of that playing out through a couple of slides.

34. I’m going to try and do this myself rather than call Mr Smart because hopefully this is all relatively clear cut. So, the solution that the petitioner has put forward is, why can’t Highways England build the M6 slips that you know are in the plans for HS2 as part of the now current Smart Motorway Scheme? The answer to that is very simple. Highways England don’t have the legal powers to do that, and in order to get the legal powers to do that, they would have to promote compulsory purchase orders and roads orders in order to be able to do it and that would take us up to about the same sort of time that we will be in a position to start building those slips once this Act, if it proceeds on its current timetable, has achieved Royal Assent.

35. So, that solution, whilst it sounds, on the face of it, an attractive one, it doesn’t actually deliver any acceleration of the timing of delivery of those slips. So, the sensible thing is to get those slips into place, under the HS2 Act, as soon as we reasonably can. And if I put up P148(4), you’ll remember that that is precisely the assurance that we have given to Staffordshire County Council.

36. Now, when those slips are in place, P148(5), and the railhead has come into operation, we’ll look to maximise rail-based deliveries and exportation of material. So, that will become the main transfer point for moving material up and down the route whether by road or by rail, away from the trace and out onto either the existing rail network or onto the strategic road network.

37. Now until those things have been done, we do have to have traffic on the local roads in order to set up some of the construction compounds in the area. What we’ve also said to Staffordshire is that once that’s done, we’re going to seek to maximise the amount of material that goes through haul roads and to get those haul roads into use as soon as possible, and that’s assurance 1483.

38. I won’t read this out, but you’ll see that that’s the effect of that assurance. Let me just show you the network of the haul roads that we have proposed through this part of the route, P147(1). This is just to give you your context. We’ve got a plan here, and you’ll see I’ve got a series of inset plans and I’m going to show you each of them very quickly in order, but just to give a sense, we’re going to show the construction route from the south of Stone, going all the way through the area of Stone, the railhead here,
and then just up to the north.

39. So, let’s go to 147(2), and you can see the yellow haul road coming all the way up from Stone Road to the south, and you can see it carrying continuously along the trace. As we approach the area of Stone, we go over to the next page. We can see the haul road passing through. This is the compound, the satellite compound that we need to set up via some limited early use of this byway open to all traffic. But once that’s been done, as I’ll show you in a moment on a graph, then this work, these works here are served entirely from the haul road.

40. The haul road continues through, up towards the area of the railhead. Here we are. Here’s the railhead. You can see the network of haul roads coming in from all points of the compass as it were. The purpose of those is to move material up and down the trace without taking it onto the public roads.

41. Then if we go to the next and final slide in this sequence, you can see that network of haul roads coming up. Here is the Meaford viaduct here, so it takes us up towards the northern end of the area that Mr Fletcher was concerned with. So, get that in place as soon as we can and move as much material around on that dedicated system of roads in and out of the railhead, in and out of the M6 slips, once they’re up and running.

42. What do we need to do at the start? Just to go to the two or three routes that he mentioned, firstly, Pirehill Lane, P148(17). Pirehill Lane, as I mentioned a minute ago, that’s needed for access to the Yarlet embankment satellite compound for site setup and servicing, and by haul road thereafter to the A34 Stone Road. In order to avoid coming back to this slide, you’ll see we give a brief outline of why we need to put traffic on the Eccleshall Road for site setup of the Yarlet north cutting satellite compound and for some further works to the Yarlet embankment satellite compound.

43. If we then turn on to P148(22), this is the traffic that’s involved in setting up that satellite compound via the byway open to all traffic, Pirehill Lane. You’ll see that it’s limited to that, that period of just under a year, from January 21 through to the end of 2021, and thereafter, you see the traffic reduces to the minimal.

44. And if we go down to 23, bit more traffic on the Eccleshall Road, but again, you can see the spike is coming at the start. That’s consistent with the setup of the
compound and then the traffic reduces as we go forward. Slight increase in traffic again at the end, when we go towards the rail systems works. But again, this is on the public highway, but as I say, able to keep the traffic down through the use of the haul roads. Then finally, Yarnfield Lane. I won’t trouble you long for this because you’re very familiar with it – P148(24). Again, the spike, as you’re familiar with, is at the start of the process, when we’re getting the slips under construction.

45. And if we go to the next slide, anticipating seeking to accelerate the process of getting the slips into place, this assumes that we’ve accelerated the slips. In accordance with the assurance given to the county council, you can see that we’re bringing forward the point at which the traffic begins to fall away to the residual.

46. So, I’m not going to say that we don’t have fairly substantial numbers of construction vehicles going along those roads that have been mentioned, particularly at the outset of construction, but we have taken steps, with the local highway authority, and we’ve given those assurances to seek to limit it and to make the best use we can of off-road transportation throughout the main period of the construction process.

47. The final point related to the proposals to upgrade the A51 Aston roundabout, if we can just go to P147(1). The roundabout in question is, if I can find it on this route – thank you very much indeed; that’s the one. This is the roundabout that the petitioner is concerned about. The A34 is coming in here from off the page, at the bottom of the slide, from the Stafford bypass. The concern of the county council, as the highway authority for the strategic road network around Stafford, was that the numbers of vehicles that would be going on to that bypass associated with HS2, would bring significant difficulties due to the existing flows, but also there’s quite a lot of development going on around that part of Stafford. So, they asked us if we would consider splitting that traffic so that a proportion of it comes up the A34, but a further proportion of it comes up the A51 and converges, obviously, on that roundabout.

48. So, in each case, the HS2 traffic is either going north/south on the A34, or it’s going north/south on the A51 and then onto the A34 northbound. So, the movement that the petitioner was concerned about, which was traffic doing a loop as it were, that won’t occur with HS2 traffic. It’s not part of the routing. It’s designed to alleviate the volume of traffic while splitting it into two roads, and both of those roads are A roads, so it
makes obvious sense to join with the highway authority in achieving that particular improvement in our routing. That’s all I want to say about that.

49. MRS MURRAY: Just a couple of things really. Could you explain LGV for me, please?

50. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Yes. An LGV is a large goods vehicle, which is a vehicle that is above 7.5 tonnes. An HGV is a heavy goods vehicle, which is a vehicle above 3.5 tonnes.

51. MRS MURRAY: So you could, in effect, halve a 32 tonne vehicle as a –

52. MR MOULD QC (DfT): That would be an LGV.

53. MRS MURRAY: An LGV?

54. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Yes.

55. MRS MURRAY: Okay. Your traffic movement maps didn’t show any LGVs. It just said HGVs?

56. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Yes. The division for the purposes of showing those is anything that’s above 3.5 tonnes. So, it will be either HGVs or LGVs, depending on the tonnage.

57. MRS MURRAY: So all of those vehicles that we’ve seen are –

58. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Either LGVs or HGVs.

59. MRS MURRAY: But they could all be LGVs? They could all be larger vehicles?

60. THE CHAIR: Could we at some point have a picture of these things so we can actually –

61. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Yes.

62. THE CHAIR: Laymen – we actually know what that looks like. Big, or very big.

63. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Yes, I will.
64. THE CHAIR: Fantastic, thank you very much.

65. MRS MURRAY: And it would be useful to be able to differentiate between the two when you’re putting together those diagrams.

66. MR MOULD QC (DfT): That would be very difficult. I think what you can assume, it will be a mixture of both, but I’ll ask if we can do that, but I think it depends very much –

67. MRS MURRAY: Some idea as to the proportion. 50/50, 60/40 –

68. MR MOULD QC (DfT): I’ll see if I can give you something.

69. MRS MURRAY: Thank you. And the other thing is you explained the difference between the traffic using the A34 and the A51.

70. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Yes.

71. MRS MURRAY: But it seems in the evidence from the parish councils that it was going to involve an extra road leading from that roundabout?

72. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Yes, I can just explain that to you. There’s going to be a feeder lane on the southern arm of that roundabout. If I can just see if we can get the pointer. In other words, traffic that is emerging northbound on the A51 and does want to turn southbound on the A34, during the morning peak, unless we provide a dedicated feeder lane on that movement, there’s going to be a lot of queueing building up on the A51 because a lot of traffic is coming south of the A34 in the morning peak. So, the idea of including that feeder lane in the amendment that’s going to be brought forward is to enable that traffic to filter onto the A34 southbound without clogging up the roundabout.

73. MRS MURRAY: And Mr Mould, you might not be able to answer this, but clearly you’ve had dialogue with the local highway authority, the county council. Do you know if they have had dialogue with the parish councils before agreeing this plan?

74. MR MOULD QC (DfT): I’m afraid I don’t, but as I have said to you when you’ve raised this point before, I would assume that there has been some discussion because the highway authority take on the role, as I understand it, of seeking to
represent the concerns that their local communities have raised about the traffic impacts of the construction of this phase of the railway.

75. MRS MURRAY: Okay, thank you very much. Thank you, Chairman.

76. THE CHAIR: Thank you. You don’t have to, Mr Fletcher, but if there’s anything you want to say, you can, as a final word.

77. MR FLETCHER: There’s a question on what we’ve just been talking about. The traffic that’s coming up the A34 and going down the A51. As I understand it from Mr Mould, the only traffic that’s going to do that movement is going to be in this direction and come down there. There isn’t going to be any HGV traffic going the opposite direction. Is that correct?

78. MR MOULD QC (DfT): No, no. I said that the reason why the feeder lane is being added in was to enable traffic that is currently on the A51 looking to turn left onto the A34, in the morning, our modelling shows that there’ll be a build-up of traffic on that arm and unless we provide a feeder lane, it’s going to be very difficult for cars and other vehicles coming out of that to continue with their journey.

79. The HS2 traffic will be either going northbound on the A34 through that roundabout and continuing north or coming southbound and through that roundabout and continuing south, or under this revised proposal, coming northbound on the A51 and then going north on the A34, or coming southbound on the A34 and going south on the A51. But the movement that you were concerned about, which was traffic going north on the A34 and then turning right to go down south on the A51, that isn’t a movement that HS2 will need to undertake.

80. MR FLETCHER: That’s the main question. I can tell my council that there isn’t going to be a right turn movement there that is from HS2.

81. MR MOULD QC (DfT): That is exactly the point, yes.

82. MR FLETCHER: Okay, I’m surprised. That isn’t quite what I understand the drawing to show.

83. THE CHAIR: We’ve got the assurance. Fantastic.
MR FLETCHER: That’s great.

THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.

MR FLETCHER: There’s only just one other thing.

THE CHAIR: Go on, please.

MR FLETCHER: On P148(22), please, the title there is Eccleshall Road and Coombe Park Road. That does not include the BOAT.

MR MOULD QC (DfT): No, sorry.

MR FLETCHER: So, I assume there’s no traffic on the BOAT. I don’t know why it’s only going to Coombe Park Road.

MR MOULD QC (DfT): Well, I put these things up because I advise quickly because I try not to take up too much time but I can just show you that does include traffic on the –

MR FLETCHER: So that title is not correct.

MR MOULD QC (DfT): Let me just put the slide up that confirms it.

THE CHAIR: We’ll pause and we’ll get the slide up and we’ll deal with the issue. Perhaps this is a convenient time to say we are expecting votes this afternoon. When the bell rings, we will take 15 minutes. If there’s an additional vote, we’ll take an additional 10 minutes for every vote.

MR MOULD QC (DfT): Thank you. P148(20). Can we blow this up a bit? You’ll remember that graph was showing traffic going through points G and H. As you can see, traffic going through that point is traffic going up and down Pirehill Lane and their origin and destination, as I explained a few minutes ago, is this satellite compound, Yarlet embankment satellite compound. I think the bridleway open to all traffic begins at about the point where we have the legend Pirehill Lane. And the judgment is that Pirehill Lane, although clearly not a full carriageway, is able to accommodate, with careful management, the relatively limited amount of heavy/large goods vehicle traffic that will need to go down that road. That’s the judgment of the project. If it’s wrong,
something will have to be done to resolve it, but that is the judgment we have made and
the county council, who are responsible both for bridleways open to all traffic, as I
understand it, they reluctantly accept that, for the limited purposes for which it’s
required, that road can be made to work.

96. MR WHITFIELD: Can I just ask –

97. THE CHAIR: Okay, with an air of scepticism. Martin.

98. MR WHITFIELD: How much contact have you had with the council regarding
these highways?

99. MR FLETCHER: You’re talking about the county council? Actually,
unfortunately, not as much as we would have liked, and certainly we’ve heard nothing
from the county council about the agreement or the undertakings which have been
agreed in this last week. Maybe they’re on their way and they could be with my clerk
now. I don’t know. But before I came here today, we hadn’t heard from the county
council about their meeting with HS2 and the arrangement and undertakings that came
out of that meeting. So the things that I’ve talked to you about really, a little bit
yesterday, but I didn’t know about them before the weekend.

100. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Well we have, we’re there for in advance of the county
council because we’ve made them known to you already, I think, haven’t we?


102. THE CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr Fletcher. Mr Mould? So, as you pack
up your stuff, we’re next moving up to the next petitioner.

103. MR FLETCHER: Thank you.

104. THE CHAIR: Welcome, Mr Cook. Thank you for coming today.

David Cook/Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council

Submissions by Mr Cook

105. MR COOK: Thank you, Chairman. Good afternoon. My name is Dave Cook and
I’m a resident of Ingestre. To assist with the timetable, I will also be presenting on
behalf of Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council, which includes St Mary’s the Virgin Church in Ingestre and also the Friends of Ingestre in our entry.

106. THE CHAIR: That’s very good of you. Very helpful.

107. MR COOK: As I’m sure you’re aware, Ingestre and Tixall, small idyllic villages that have a combined population of about approximately 400 located five kilometres east of Stafford and residents of both villages are affected by HS2.

108. St Mary’s the Virgin Church in Ingestre, a grade I listed building designed by one of the world’s greatest architects, Sir Christopher Wren. The only known church outside of London to be so, was built in 1671 on the site of the original church and still today incorporates some of the stained-glass windows dating back to the 13th century. A considerable tourist attraction, needs donations from those tourists, people visiting and the 10 to 12 weddings a year that it puts on for its upkeep and maintenance. Ingestre Orangery, likewise, another wonderful building, grade II listed, located in a peaceful, tranquil environment. As a result of some outstanding work by local residents who have been able to raise funding, it’s currently undergoing restoration and will be concluded next year. It will become a heritage hub and like the church, it currently and will continue to rely upon donations from people visiting it. Slide 2, please.

109. As can be seen from that image there, the two villages joined currently by historic parkland will be separated with a line going right through the middle of the golf club. Above the line is Ingestre and below the line is Tixall.

110. MR MARTIN: Chair, before we move on from the map, the church is the one marked CH, is that right? Just above Town Field?

111. MR COOK: Just above where, sorry, sir?

112. MR MARTIN: Town Field. And you’ve got CH. Is that the church?

113. THE CHAIR: Can we highlight that? I can’t see. Can you find it and highlight it?

114. MR MARTIN: I was looking for a church, but I can’t see a church mark.

115. MR COOK: You can see where Ingestre Hall is?
116. MR MARTIN: Yes.

117. MR COOK: It’s right by Ingestre Hall, the church.

118. MR MARTIN: Right, so I can’t see it on this map?

119. MR COOK: No, I can’t see it on this map either. But it’s right next to Ingestre Hall.

120. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Can you see the red dot?

121. MR MARTIN: Yes.

122. MR MOULD QC (DfT): I’m not sure where that is precisely, but it’s in that area.

123. MR COOK: It will become evident later on. Can I have slide 3, please? So, within the EIA that was published, it was recorded that there is an intention to put a temporary traffic island at Hoo Mill crossroads. This is where Great Haywood Road, Tixall Road, Hoo Mill Lane and Ingestre Park Road all meet and that’s shown there at A. And within the EIA, it’s suggested that the road would need to be closed overnight on occasions for construction of the viaduct and there would be no vehicle access. We petitioned against this in the first instance that there clearly should be 24/7 access for emergency vehicles. This is the only road in and out of the village. Within a 12-month period, there’s been 53 calls for ambulance services, lots of elderly residents and also a care home for the disabled as well.

124. We also said that we need access for residents. I myself work in a role where sometimes I’m on call and get called out in the middle of the night and need to be able to respond.

125. We met with representatives from HS2 on the second of this month and very shortly afterwards, received an assurance in relation to emergency vehicles that said that emergency vehicles would be provided access at all times. One of the parish council members wrote back enquiring about the public and the position with those and the most recent communications suggest that they will not prevent vehicle access to Ingestre from Hoo Mill Lane crossroads via Ingestre Park Road in all reasonable foreseeable circumstances. That’s acceptable to me. Obviously, the parish council will have to
make their decision. For residents, however, I do not believe that’s acceptable for emergency vehicles. Emergency vehicles, in my view, have to have access. I’m not a barrister; I’m not a solicitor, but I would imagine, under human rights legislation, article, right to life, there has be a facility to get emergency care to people that may require it. And we’d seek clarity from HS2 that actually, the original assurance that was given in relation to emergency vehicles, 24/7 access is still in place.

126. Slide 4, please. Slide 4 was another issue around access, again, at A, for Ingestre Pavilion. We’d like to thank HS2. They have now resolved this and will be providing access and we are grateful for that assurance.

127. We are greatly concerned about the number of HGV vehicles that will be using the minor roads, particularly Blackheath Lane, Tixall Road, Great Haywood Road, Hoo Mill and Ingestre Park Road. We acknowledge that because of the location, routes for HGVs are very difficult. There is a low bridge from Great Haywood, 3.5 metres, and two very narrow bridges on Holdiford Lane, which makes them completely unsuitable for HGV construction traffic.

128. The present proposal is that the HGV vehicles, including those two and from the main A51 construction compound and those travelling to the satellite compounds are Hanyards and Hoo Mill, will travel A51 to western, west on the 518, past the county showground to the island at Blackheath Lane, south on Blackheath Lane and then east on Tixall Road.

129. Blackheath Lane is already very busy. It serves a proxy east and distributor road for Stafford. It’s the principal access to Western Road High School, the one of the Stafford University Campuses and Stafford Crematorium. The actual crematorium exit, where vehicles come out of goes directly on to Blackheath Lane. Major delays already occur at this location during peak times and the disruption will clearly increase with the addition of construction traffic.

130. HS2 figures that have been provided suggest the junction is within capacity. I have to say, Chair, that’s not the experience of local residents. The delays at the junction are also significantly increased when the county showground are hosting a larger event. You heard this morning about the importance of that.
131. In addition, the island now also provides access to an ever-increasing industrial estate to the north of Blackheath Lane.

132. MR MARTIN: Chair, can I ask, is all of this on P170, on the map? Because I find it very difficult to work out what you’re saying without having any access to where those things are. I don’t know where Blackheath Lane is, I’m afraid. …

133. MR COOK: So, bear with me. Let me just get my bearings right. So, this is Blackheath Lane here. 179(13).

134. THE CHAIR: The advantage of having a member of Parliament in the audience. He passes the test, knowing his constituency.

135. MR COOK: My eyes aren’t as good as they should be, I’m afraid. You can see it there. Blackheath Lane. Where I’m talking about, north of the A51, then down the 518 western, past the county showground, and then it comes to the island there and this is the island that we’re currently discussing there, at Blackheath Lane. There is now a road that goes off there to the left, which leads onto an industrial estate, which, as I’ve said, is increasing all the time.

136. THE CHAIR: Okay.

137. MR WHITFIELD: Sorry, just above K there, that’s a school, isn’t it?

138. MR MARTIN: Yes.

139. MR COOK: Weston High School.

140. MR MARTIN: It is easier to see on P170, I have to say, because that’s actually got the things marked on it and not just the dotted lines.

141. MR WIGGIN: You’ve got the school and the cemetery, and everything marked on P170. If you leave on for about three seconds, it will actually come into focus.

142. MR MARTIN: Yes, there’s the school and there’s the cemetery.

143. MR COOK: Yes, that’s the school and that’s the university campus there and that’s the crematorium and the exit to the crematorium is there. The entrance is actually here and there’s Tixall there. Thank you.
144. As I’ve said, obviously those delays are increased when the county showground, which you heard about earlier, has large events on. We note the histogram that’s recently been shared with us, highlighting the anticipated HGV movements at this location between January ’21 and January ’25, a four-year-period. Those numbers ranging between an excess of 200-a-day for three months and under 40 a day for approximately 6 months with a mixture in between.

145. We’re pleased to see that the peak numbers are not anticipated to be for prolonged periods, but still believe that these numbers concerned will present significant congestion at this junction.

146. The crossroads junction with Tixall Road, which is here, is controlled by traffic lights. To the west, as I’ve just highlighted, is the entrance to the crematorium and HS2 report that this junction is operated within capacity. We’re concerned that the additional construction traffic, in particular HGVs will cause significant delays at this junction.

147. Can I go over to slide 7, please? So, as we come down here, Blackheath Lane, that’s the junction there. The construction traffic will turn left onto Tixall Road and some of it will go up Hanyards Lane to a construction plant there. We’re concerned that once the traffic has negotiated the Blackheath Lane island, then up to the traffic lights and turn left, there are peak periods. There could be 90 vehicles a day that will turn left into Hanyards. This junction is only 22 metres into Tixall Road. We’re concerned that vehicles, when entering there or when coming out and trying to go back along Blackheath Road, that they’re going to cause significant congestion at that junction.

148. HS2 have looked at that and have said to us that to alter that junction would create more problems than it would solve, but haven’t come up with anything else yet. Clearly we’re very concerned about that and the delays that it will cause.

149. Slide 5, please. We note that whilst HS2 has said it will be necessary to widen sections of the road and corners between Tixall Village and Hoo Mill Lane – and this is now Tixall Road – so Hoo Mill Lane we looked at earlier and C, which is Tixall Village. That’s Great Haywood Road, sorry, down there and then it becomes Tixall Road. HS2 have advised us that along that route, some of the bends are not suitable for HGVs to pass so will be giving some work. However, there is no work planned at the present between points C and B, the rest of Tixall Road, up to those traffic lights that we’ve just
looked at.

150. We’re concerned by this and we request that the Committee invite HS2, with members of the parish council present to discuss these concerns. There are inclines as you go up here and some of those bends do not give the greatest view, and we’re concerned from a safety point of view that there may be some remedial work that’s required there.

151. Slide 6 please. We’re looking at Tixall Road in particular. We just picked one road to illustrate the numbers. So, 2016 baseline figures for Tixall Road during the peak hours. So, that is the stretch of road that we just looked at between A and B. During the peak hours between 8.00 and 9.00 in the morning and 7.00 and 8.00 at night, it is 10 HGV vehicles. So, not a significant amount. HS2 predicted journeys using the same location in the peak period is 162 heavy goods vehicles – so a significant increase. We again note the recent histogram that’s been provided in respect of Tixall Road. Again, we are pleased to see that you predict the numbers of construction HGVs using this road for the same four year period will peak for one month only at 162 a month, then averaging 120 movements a day – and then the movements reducing down. However, we still believe that this will lead to congestion and noise within that location.

152. The rest of it on there is something that I need to go away and think about to be perfectly honest with you. HS2 within the EIA have given predicted figures for HGV vehicles within peak hours on that same road. And you can see that 2023, it’s a 750% increase on the 2016 levels – and 2014, it’s over a 1000% increase. I asked HS2 what that was and they said it was based on a normal formula that’s used with developments going on. Well, unless they know something I don’t – that there’s going to a great, big heavy goods vehicle depot in Hoo Mill – I can’t see that those figures can be correct. And if they are, we’ll suggest you scrap HS2 and build some more roads for vehicles. Slide 8, please.

153. HS2 have long said, and it’s been mentioned in some of the petitions that I’ve talked about here, about using haul routes. We acknowledge that the provision of haul routes from A51 compound back across is very, very difficult. There’s a train line for parts of it. And to provide that, you would have to go towards Pasturefields and it would be difficult. However, we believe that HS2 should begin a haul road at the point
where the line crosses the A518. So, at the point near to the county showground. A
haul route there that could follow the route all the way up to Hoo Mill would prevent or
seriously reduce the number of HGV vehicles that would have to use those minor roads
that we’ve just discussed. There would have to be a haul route alongside to remove
stuff in any event. And our request is that the Committee direct HS2 to investigate and
implement that suggestion, which will drastically reduce the impact on our
communities. Slide 9 please.

154. We’re concerned that the residents of Ingestre and Tixall will be subjected to an
increase in noise during the construction and operation of HS2. I am not going to go
into all the technicalities. I am sure that you have dealt with them far more than I. But
you know that the current base level has been set at 50 dB for daytime. We believe that
in our location the actual readings at the moment are in the low 30s, and accepting HS2
will say that 50 is not significant above that, if you are currently living with and used to
something in a low 30s to suddenly go up to 50, that is more than 15 increase, which is
considered a major adverse impact. There are some figures there from the technical
appendices: the daytime readings for Ingestre vary between 43 and 44. There’s others
there – Bottle Lodge, 28, Bottle Lodge is actually the closest dwelling to the road in all
of the area that we’re discussing there. I’m not too sure how that’s come up with. Next
slide please – 10.

155. We believe that lots of the readings that have been published for locations are
inaccurate. Those top two pictures are of my garden. The one on the left – it borders
the golf course – and looking down the right, you go down that driveway, through a
large paddock, before you get to Ingestre Park Road – that single road in and out of the
village. Below it is a location which I know from Mr Lefroy’s presentation this
morning you’re familiar with. The canal shop, a thriving business; a nursery, a café;
pleasure boats – more there; the marina and businesses at the back. Its entrance is right
on the main road in Great Haywood. And if you recall – in fact, I think you can see it in
a right hand lane just in the background there – it’s right on a railway line as well.

156. HS2 figures suggest that my garden has the same ambient background noise as the
canal shop. We did raise a question with HS2 in a recent meeting concerning the
readings and it appears with some figures that were provided to us very recently that
within Ingestre three locations have actually had readings taken and the rest have been
assumed or calculated from those.

157. One of those at Hoo Mill. I’m not sure if it’s actually on the traffic junction, where the traffic goes around or if it is down Hoo Mill Lane. But if it’s down Hoo Mill Lane it’s a distance away from the rest of the Ingestre. It’s also closer to the existing railway that’s there and the A51 road.

158. The other one is at Birch Hall Farm, which is the directly opposite end of the village. It is a working farm and operates a business there for vintage tractor parts.

159. And the final one is a cottage, which is in the village but it also happens to be probably – I’ve not measured it – but probably closest to the golf club car park and certainly the closest to the shed where all the machinery’s kept that comes backwards and forwards when they’re mowing their laws.

160. For Tixall, four properties have been used, which include two working farms.

161. We believe clearly that these readings or the readings they have attributed to various addresses are incorrect and that we should have correct readings made. Can I have slide 11 please?

162. So, within Ingestre and Tixall there’s eight business properties, 106 residences and one church within a kilometre of the proposed route. As I’ve said early, the construction traffic is extremely likely to cause adverse noise affects to residential dwellings adjacent to Tixall Road and Hanyards and between the proposed scheme and Tixall Road. I’ve touched on earlier, where those red dots are here, are houses that are very close to the roads where the increased number of HGVs will be travelling. And as I touched on earlier, Bottle Lodge is within one metre of the road.

163. We believe that the current noise levels set by HS2 are too high for the area and that the figures have been set without any context. We believe that the context must be taken into consideration. Within the garden of many properties – and I can certainly say for my own – the highest volume background noise is that of birdsong – which with respect, Chair, is very different to the noise of construction and passing trains every couple of minutes. Within the EIA mention is made of communities being able to seek additional mitigation having regard to the context. But having regard to the context of
the noise within specific locations. We believe ultimately that is something we may need to apply for but can’t see how we can do it if no context is currently recorded or accurate figures are recorded. 12 please.

164. HS2 will require ongoing maintenance at night causing further disruption and disturbance to local residents. Ingestre Church is now hosting concerts, obviously to assist with funding it. And Ingestre Stables hosts outdoor amateur dramatic shows. Both will be impacted if there is a significant increase in the noise. We request that HS2 be directed to obtain accurate and current baseline figures and context of the current noise levels. 13 please.

165. The area contains a unique collection of listed buildings within a few hundred metres of the line. For example, St Mary’s the Virgin Church, grade 1 listed, is 400 metres; Ingestre Hall, grade 2 listed, is 350 metres; and Ingestre Pavilion, grade 2 again, is closer still at 150 metres. We are concerned at the effect that vibration may have on these and other historic buildings that have no substantial footings. The reality is that we will not know what if any vibration will be caused during the operation of HS2 until it is up and running. Whilst a lot of modelling can be completed and comparisons with other similar projects, the fact remains that no one will know for sure until it is running.

166. However, we believe that groundwork testing should have been conducted before now in respect of the substantial Hanyards cutting. It is nearly 20 metres deep in hard sandstone and it is not known at this time if blasting may be required to produce that cutting – and if blasting is required, what effect this may have on the buildings. We believe that those preparatory works should have been done in advance of this so that alternatives could have been considered.

167. We will come on to visual effects. I understand that you visited the area so hopefully you have seen both Ingestre and Tixall and enjoyed the buildings and parkland. Slide 14 please. The visual intrusion on the historic landscape, conservation areas and listed buildings is severe in our opinion.

168. And we believe that it is imperative that the parish council and local residents are actively engaged and involved in final designs – for example, the viaduct design. We’re aware that it’s a very significant and substantial viaduct and we’re aware from HS2 that they consider it significant and will be taking design advice. We believe it’s critical that
the locals and in particular the parish council have a say in what that is – for example, if it can be cladded in local stone or local bricks to fit in with the area. We also believe that would should be consulted and listened to in terms of the sorts of noise barriers that will be fitted. That photograph there shows an example of transparent barriers, which – providing they are as efficient as it suggests – may be more pleasing aesthetically to look at both from residents but also from people using the train as well. And we believe that we and the parish council in particular should be involved in those decisions. Slide 15 please.

169. You can see there, that’s the church and the hall. So, that is the church there, right next to the hall. We strongly disagree that the Ingestre Conservation Area is only an asset of market value and are concerned at the significant adverse impact that HS2 will have on it. Can I have slide 16 please?

170. We understand that Ingestre Park Golf Club will be appearing before the Committee at a later date. Whilst local residents are keen for the club to remain, it appears unlikely that it will be able to continue when it’s dissected by a 40 metre high embankment. The area up here – just there – is the golf course. We’re greatly concerned that if the golf club moves or ceases to exist that the land either side of the line may become waste land, possibly ripe for development as a brownfields site further adversely impacting on the historic and tranquil location. I believe that if the golf club is to move that the remnant land should be planted with trees to replace further trees that have been lost during construction and that the land is made available to the communities as a public open space. 17 please.

171. So, we’re informed by HS2 that they plan to join Ingestre Wood with Lambert’s Coppice with tree planting to replace ancient woodlands that will be lost as a result of the railway. The parish council are strongly opposed to this – wishing to maintain the historic view across Deer Park at this location, known locally as Hell’s Gate. We ask the Committee that they direct HS2 to consult with the parish council and landowners concerned – who I understand have not been consulted – to gain their views on this before any further action is taken. 18 please.

172. Probably slightly further afield from actually within the villages – but because of the absence of the flight zones in the area it is a hotspot for recreational airborne
activities – in particular hot air ballooning, gliding, hang gliding – a visual intrusion particularly during construction will have a detrimental effect on those local businesses. So, slide 19 please.

173. This is around the impacts of the communities of Ingestre and Tixall. We understand and acknowledge that the government will say that in their view HS2 is a project of national significance. Our community will not see any benefit. To coin a phrase – ‘all of the pain and none of the gain’. Mr Lefroy far more eloquently than I did this morning touched on the train services from Stafford and that is something that we are extremely concerned about and would fully support his recommendations to you earlier today.

174. The workers’ camp on the A51 which will house a number of workers will undoubtedly impact on local residents. The current medical centre – again Mr Lefroy mentioned it very briefly – it’s at capacity. Many residents such as myself who work outside the area have to wait weeks to get an appointment outside of normal hours. And a further increase in people who may need these services will further impact on the situation.

175. I want to touch on health, if I may, please, Chair? We strongly object to the exclusion of the very real issue of impacts on the community of property blight and the health effects that it has on individuals. Residents have been living with property blight since the first announcement of the initial preferred route in January 2013. Even allowing for the fact that Phase 2A has been brought forward – and if in the unlikely event that it finishes on time – and as suggested at that time house prices begin to return to normal or close to normal, residents in the community will have experienced a minimum of 14 years’ property blight.

176. It is in our view absolutely unacceptable to make a pretence of assessing health impacts whilst deliberately excluding one of the most single contributing factors to anxiety and mental health. HS2 in response to this replied that, ‘The perceived health effects associated with property blight as a result of the proposed scheme are not included within the scope of the health assessment within the environmental impact assessment. The health impact assessment considers the health and wellbeing effects associated with construction and operation of the proposed scheme at a community and
route wide level rather than the effects for individuals.’

177. I’m sorry, Chair, but that response is frankly not good enough. Property blight is associated with the construction and operation of the scheme. Without the construction and operation there would not be property blight. It is also associated at community and route wide level. Communities are made up of individuals. I note within the EIA, HS2 states, ‘Some residents may suffer blight’. As a general statement that is correct. Not everybody will. They should, in my view, say quite clearly that those closest to the line will suffer because they know that is the case. Are they able to provide evidence of any properties within 750 metres of the line not suffering blight? I suspect not. And their own policies in respect of that would support it. When HS2 purchase a property under the need-to-sell scheme they don’t re-sell it because they know they won’t get the market value for it. They rent it with a view to re-selling it once the line is completed and the market goes back to normal. I do not have a problem with that. That is absolutely right. Taxpayers’ money – the right thing to do. But then to say, ‘People may be affected’ – clearly those closest to the line are affected and they should recognise that.

178. Those who suffer normally ill health; financial difficulties; divorce; have to go away with a job; have to go away to care for elderly residents or something – may qualify in the need-to-sell scheme. It is a compelling reason to sell. So, if does not capture those people who have bought properties and maybe once the kids go to university, they’ve decided that’s the time to downsize and maybe give their kids their hand, that’s all gone, unless they take a substantial loss –

179. THE CHAIR: For the sake of making sure we get the point for your local area, can I limit you a little bit to specifics to your area and what you want from us?

180. MR COOK: Yes. I’m talking about our residents. This is our residents who are affected. I understand Chair –

181. THE CHAIR: But it is where they’re specifically affected as opposed as to other people along the line. That’s where we can particularly help you.

182. MR COOK: Yes. What we’re requesting is, Chair, we believe that it’s wrong for HS2 to ignore the impact that anxiety levels, stress and depression caused by this have.
183. THE CHAIR: You made that point a number of times. You need to move on.

184. MR COOK: Yes. That’s fine. Yes. And we request that where there is medical evidence –

185. THE CHAIR: Sorry, when I said move on I meant move on from mental health onto the next point. We will now break for a vote. Be back in 15 minutes plus 10 minutes for any additional vote.

*Sitting suspended.*

*On resuming—*

186. THE CHAIR: Mr Cook, we’re still here.

187. MR COOK: Thank you Chair. Can I have slide 21 please? 21. Sorry, go to 22. Sorry. Yes. The potential loss of the golf club and its social facilities with have a real negative impact on the local community. We’ve no other facilities within the village. We also note that there’s three other businesses that aren’t featuring within the EIA – Ingestre Lodges; Acorn Services, the vintage tractor parts; and a car and motorcycle service and repair on Trent Drive. We have now been provided with details of the Community & Environment Fund and a Business & Local Economy Fund. And we will provide it to all of those parties. So, can I have slide 24 please?

188. 24 is a failure of HS2 to act on previous requests from the parish council. So, the parish council is very concerned that information previously provided to HS2 has been ignored. They’ve consistently reported that the deep cutting should be named Hanyards cutting and not Brancote south. The parish council believe this is an error maybe because of an error on Google maps, which shows Brancote Farm as at Hanyards. The currently named Brancote south cutting is actually north of Brancote. The parish council are concerned that vehicles attending an emergency may go to the wrong location. HS2 have helpfully replied that, ‘Naming consistency guidelines have been used and that the design drawings and all the contractors will know and have specified routes to the location’. The parish council acknowledges that this may well work in construction but once that’s finished if there is an emergency, will emergency services be directed to the wrong location? So, they ask again that the matter be addressed and
the correct names applied.

189. THE CHAIR: HS2 don’t get to rename your community. Carry on.

190. MR COOK: Okay. So, the final few slides were touched upon by Mr Lefroy earlier and Mr Mould and very much about understanding the hydrology in the area. As we said earlier, HS2 on the preferred route, the current route that they’re taking changed the route for the sole purpose of avoiding having to complete an appropriate assessment of the route to the north of Pasturefields. Recent documentation adds a number of things to those lists but please be assured that their documentation says quite categorically that the sole purpose that they chose the route was to avoid an appropriate assessment which they thought might take some time and therefore delay the project.

191. We from all the consultations that have taken place and previous petitions – we were allowed to petition on Stage One – have consistently said that an appropriate assessment should have been conducted, particular after the salt marsh in Ingestre was identified to them. And it goes through. An appropriate assessment would have given them an informed – the most informed – decision on what to take. I fully accept that there are very educated individuals who are assessing the potential impacts but that is exactly what it is – it is their assessment. Had an appropriate assessment been conducted at the time we would know for definite the impacts, if any, that building the original route would have taken. Would it have impacted? We don’t know. Could it have been mitigated for a far lower cost than the £178 million that it is at 2012 prices for construction only? Would the current route impact on Pasturefields? Again, the way of finding out would have been to conduct an appropriate assessment, which they have continually refused to do so. And we still believe that one should be conducted. We are very –

192. MR WIGGIN: Sorry, what would you expect it to say that it wouldn’t otherwise say?

193. MR COOK: Well, if an appropriate assessment was conducted and the original route was there and it could be done at a far cheaper cost without impacting, then clearly that should have been done, sir.

194. We note with a great deal of interest material very recently shared with us by HS2
in respect of this. They’ve stated that, ‘The promoter, the Environment Agency and Natural England are in agreement that the southern route is the only route that can be certain as to not impact on Pasturefields and therefore must be chosen’. I just seek confirmation from HS2 that they are now saying for certain, without any doubt, that it will not be effected, because, they’ve never previously said that. They’ve always previously said that whatever they find, they will mitigate. So, if they found that the current route impacts on Pasturefields that they would mitigate. This is suggesting now that they’re saying they are certain it will not.

195. THE CHAIR: No one’s actioned my request for questions. So, Mr Mould?

Evidence of Mr Thornely-Taylor

196. MR MOULD QC (DfT): I’m going to start by asking Mr Thornely-Taylor to deal with the noise issues that have been raised. And we’ll start I think with document R84, because Mr Thornely-Taylor, with the – Mr Cook raised some points about the reliability of the monitoring of existing noise levels. I think you wanted to show the Committee this plan in order to deal with that?

197. MR THORNELY-TAYLOR: Yes. I think perhaps if I start with the point Mr Cook made about the Ingestre area monitoring. I think there’s a mouse which I can use, is there? Thank you. The location we were talking about – I believe Mr Cook’s own property is here, if I’ve got it right.

198. MR COOK: Yes.

199. MR THORNELY-TAYLOR: Ingestre Hall is here, the church is there, the orangery is there. And all these locations used for their baseline levels, monitoring obtained here. And I take the point that the golf course vehicles could come out and contribute to measured levels but having been to this area and experienced the noise environment I have no reason to doubt that the figures for this location are as you would expect for a rural location without through traffic.

200. Mr Cook made the point about them being the same as the figures for baseline for Canalside Shop, which is down here. Actually, that’s not right. The numbers in the ES for the Canalside Shop are four dB higher than these ones. This is actually one of the
few locations which wasn’t measured. It was predicted because it is strongly influenced by noise from the highway and from the railway. This runs from Colwich to Macclesfield along here.

201. The other point Mr Cook made was about Bottle Lodge, which is here. It is true there isn’t a measured baseline for Bottle Lodge but it is a long way from the alignment and not a particularly sensitive assessment.

202. But I do need to make the point that while baseline noise levels are clearly important and they do, as I explained in my presentation on 27 March, they do play a part in the environmental assessment. The principal consideration relates to government policy on noise, deriving from the noise policy statement for England and implemented by HS2 in its information papers.

203. And this leads to one of Mr Cook’s important points, which is he considers that the lowest observed adverse effect level for the operation of the railway at 50 is too high a number and that it represents a big step up from the baseline. I just need to go back to a point which I made in my presentation back in March, which was that the LAeq index, when you’re dealing with railway noise, is an index. It’s not saying the noise level goes up to a continuous level of 50.

204. As it would if we were planning a highway through here – if this was going to be the M something or other – as we all know when we visited areas quite some distance from highways of that kind, the noise level goes up. And that is that. It never comes down. There’s a continual rise in background noise level due to uninterrupted traffic flows. In the case of HS2 and other railways, it’s not like that at all. When a train is not passing there is no effect whatsoever on the noise environment. When trains pass, you hear them. And the Committee heard a simulation in the sound lab on 27 March for Great Haywood in a position with a certain amount of relevance to Ingestre and Tixall. They heard you certainly do hear the trains. In between train passes, there’s nothing.

205. And the 50 is an index to take account both of the noise level that occurs at a maximum of a train’s going by and the number of times that happens. We will remember from sound lab, we actually had to wait quite a long time to hear the next train go by. And the important thing is that in setting 50 as the lowest observed adverse effect level, this assumed no continuation from background or baseline. It was the level
at which adverse effects on health and quality of life occur in hypothetically, in a location where there’s no background noise level at all, if such a place could exist. In reality, there’s always some background noise level. If it does exist – if anything – it reduces the overall effect of the noise of the passage of trains. So, I just wanted to make the point, we’re not talking about noise levels going up to 50 dBA.

206. The LAeq index is an index and it’s a way of telling you the combination effect of maximum levels while a train is passing and number of trains. It’s the same number of course that was tested in the parliamentary process for Phase One and is now well established as a lowest observed adverse effect level for railway noise.

207. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Thank you. Let’s turn to vibration and we’ll put up P144 please. Can you just help us? If we can blow up the key a bit? On the right hand side of the key of this slide, we can see there are two notations. Firstly, ground-borne noises, sound and vibration study area, residential and non-residential – which is that orange and black dashed line. And then, the blue and black dashed line, which is ground-borne sound and vibration study area for highly sensitive non-residential. And if we can then come up to the plan itself? Again we see Mr Cook’s property has been outlined in red. And we can see Ingestre itself to the left hand side there. And we can see those two lines. Firstly, the line which represents the study area for the resident and non-sensitive non-residential – which is either side of the line here. And then that sensitive and non-residential study area pushes out a little further from each side of the line of the railway with the blue dash. Can you just explain the significance of that?

208. MR THORNELY-TAYLOR: Yes. Those distances are chosen with regard to thresholds for ground-borne noise, which is a secondary effect of vibration. And it occurs at levels of vibration from way, way below anything which would affect buildings and even below vibration that the human being can feel with the tactile sense. From the point of view of the operation of railway, the particular receptors that Mr Cook referred to are well outside those limits. But as Mr Cook pointed out, if blasting were to occur that is a separate consideration. If it is not currently proposed that the sandstone would be extracted using blasting, there are many ways of removing sandstone which are extremely low vibration in nature. If for any reason it was considered to be the best way to remove sandstone, there are methods of carrying out blasting in a way which minimises vibration. For example, in –
209. THE CHAIR: Let’s not worry about something that’s not planned to happen at
the moment.

210. MR MOULD QC (DfT): And then the final thing that I think you wanted to
address related to the relationship between Mr Cook’s property as a proxy for residents
of Ingestre and the railway works at this location. And we can see the extent of the
lowest observed adverse effect level contour on this plan, which stops well to the west
of the village itself. And if we then turn to P180? We have shown some cross sections
and I want to identify cross sections 2A to 2B, which as you can see is orientated from
the petitioner’s property then directly across the railway line looking southwards and then –

211. MR THORNELY-TAYLOR: It goes slightly to the west of the petitioner’s
property. 2A is actually at Ingestre Hall itself.

212. MR MOULD QC (DfT): I’m sorry. Thank you. And then if we go to the next
page, P181, we can see that section. And it’s the middle section I think we’ll find when
the screen fills up. Did you want to make a point about this?

213. MR THORNELY-TAYLOR: Yes. We saw that 2A was at Ingestre Hall there.
And it just illustrates the fairly striking topography here and the fact that the receptors –
of which there are a number as we have seen in the Ingestre Hall area – do get a
substantial amount of protection from noise from the topography as a result of the
cutting.

214. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Thank you. Those are all my questions for Mr
Thornely-Taylor.

215. THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. Final say or final –

216. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Sorry. I was going to then ask Mr Miller to deal with
the other points that you have heard, if that’s alright?

217. THE CHAIR: Absolutely. I misunderstood. Can we perhaps change the witness?

218. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Yes, thank you. Yes.

219. THE CHAIR: Apologies. I wasn’t hurrying you up –
220. MR MOULD QC (DfT): No, not at all.

221. THE CHAIR: I was just anticipating what I thought was your right to decide what to reply on and not to reply on.

**Evidence of Mr Miller**

222. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Thank you. Mr Miller, I’d like to deal with one or two points on traffic. Firstly, if we go to P179(5)? This is the assurance that’s been offered, which Mr Cook mentioned at the start of his presentation. ‘The Secretary of State would require the nominated undertaker to act in exercising the powers under the Bill not to prevent vehicular access to Ingestre from Hoo Mill crossroads, via Ingestre Park Road in all reasonably foreseeable circumstances.’ And then it explains that there will be some restrictions on parts of the road to allow for some of the works that have to be carried out. And the question is whether that is intended to lessen the commitment in relation to maintaining access for emergency vehicles. What’s the position on that?

223. MR MILLER: No. The idea of this assurance is to make sure that we maintain access for everyone in the village. So, I think that’s an important point. We’ve heard midwife the petitioner and the parish about accessing this location. And I think we’ve cleared up what’s potentially a misunderstanding. There is a bit of work that’s got to be done during construction but we think we can deal with that and maintain the access to the village.

224. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Thank you.

225. MR MILLER: And within the limits.

226. MR MOULD QC (DfT): And then, can we go on please to P179(13)? There was one or two points about the highway network around here. First of all, what’s the level of HS2 heavy traffic that we expect to have to run along these local roads, that is to say Tixall Road, Hanyards Lane, Blackheath Lane?

227. MR MILLER: You can see we’ve got vehicles – it’s a bit blurred on my screen – you can see we’ve got KNL, MNN and INJ in the tables and you can see that we’ve got what we’ve described as ‘the future baseline’. So, we’re thinking about what the traffic’s going to look like in the future. And then we’ve got some boxes which talk
about HS2 traffic – what we’re going be putting on the roads – up to on those roads. And then we’ve got HGVs being shown in either direction. So, those are the peak levels in either direction that are being shown on those particular roads. So, if you are at INJ, you’ve got a 41 HGV movements – up to 41 HGV movements – in either direction on that part of Great Haywood Road that we’ve shown there. And it follows similarly in those other roads.

228. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Can we just scroll back across? In fact, let’s go to A74 – I think it was A74(5). I’m so sorry, A74(7). The particular point that was being made was that the layout of the junction of Hanyards Lane, Tixall Road and then immediately Blackheath Lane – that that is going to give rise to difficulties with the introduction of the HS2 traffic during those peak months when we’re going to see a relatively significant increase in heavy vehicles running through this junction. What do you say about that?

229. MR MILLER: Well, if you look to the boxes about the junction arrangement here, you’ve got left turn and right turn movements variously from Blackheath Lane to Tixall Road and from Tixall Road to Hanyards Lane and the other direction – if you see what I mean. And I think we’ve got something like – if we took Tixall Road and Hanyards Lane – I think it’s 43 – we might go back to the table in a minute – left hand turn movements and similar arrangements for right hand turn movements. So, those are the peak levels that we’re going up to. And over a 10 hour day that’s looking something like one movement in either direction per quarter of an hour. I don’t think it is very heavy and I’m not sure what’s shown in picture A – because you can see the traffic lights there, the junction – and Mr Cook pointed out whether that’s during the day or whether that’s actually the peak. There aren’t many vehicles in that –

230. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Sorry?

231. MR COOK: During the day.

232. MR MILLER: During the day. Yes. I guess it probably was. So, there will be turning movements on to that junction but they’re relatively few. They will be additional. But we’ve commented before in this Committee that even with this sort of level of traffic we don’t want or our contractors will not want to be caught in queues and have their lorries stationery in traffic. So, we look at free flow of traffic through these
junctions and we’ve talked to you about a traffic management plan before. And that’s part of the code of construction practice. They’ll come about as the contractors refine their designs and the construction arrangements. And those local arrangements for the routing of HGV type traffic and other traffic will be agreed with the local planning authority in due course.

233. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Mr Cook took us a little further along Tixall Road and said that whilst there were some sections of that route where the Bill allowed for some widening to accommodate the construction traffic, there were other parts which didn’t. And he said the parish council representing the local community would like the opportunity just to draw HS2’s attention to some concerns they have so that we are aware of where – on the basis of their local experience – some of the pinch points occurs. Is that something we’re happy to receive from them?

234. MR MILLER: Yes, we’re more than happy to receive that information. Clearly, if we can iron out any pinch points that we haven’t to date then that’s going to be to the good of the movement of our vehicles as much as anybody else’s vehicles. And you can see here probably better on the picture B there, you can see that the white lines in the middle of the road – it’s actually quite a wide road – that part of Tixall Road – and when you go all the way along to Tixall, it’s of a similar sort of width. It does get a little bit narrower, and it gets a bit wider in locations as well. But on average it’s about 5.5 metres wide that road. And then I think a point – Mr Cook pointed out that we are doing some other works on the other part of Tixall Road and closer to the railway where the road actually narrows as you go out the other side of Tixall. So, yes, we’ll be looking at these things and we’ll be looking at them with the local highways authority. If the local parish have particular concerns, we’ll take those up, have a look at those, make sure the safety aspects are taken into account. And we’ll iron these things out in due course.

235. MR MOULD QC (DfT): One other traffic point and I think Mr Cook asked for an answer on that was he was surprised by some of the future baseline numbers, particularly for HGVs on these roads. He said they seemed surprising given the relatively limited number of HGVs that one finds on the roads now. Can you just help the Committee? Where did we source our data in order to model the future baseline without HS2 in 2023?
236. MR MILLER: Each of the county authorities contribute to a model – I think it’s called the Saturn model – about traffic and they’re constantly looking at what the future conditions are on the roads so that they can plan for modifications to roads. They are particularly interested in things like new development. And you will remember when we went through and around our route visit that we came down from the route and just north of Stafford I think we pointed or representatives from Staffordshire County Council pointed to the MoD lands as a big area – a big field, in fact several large fields – and those in due course are subject to further development. So, the local transport modelling is taking account of that future development. And what that model is then saying that the existing traffic and the future growth on those roads will be re-distributed across the network.

237. THE CHAIR: I think it’s as simple as they’re not your figures?

238. MR MILLER: Yes. And it will be getting busier.

239. THE CHAIR: I think on that basis we can move on.

240. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Okay. Thank you. I’d like to put up P155(22). I’m just picking on these various points. There are very few to go now. There was a suggestion that it would be a good idea to run a haul road from the A158 southwards so as to limit the amount of traffic on the local roads. If we could pick up the A158? This is one of our standard traffic slides. And we can see the red notation is showing the proposals to route – to site the haul routes. We can see there is a site haul route, Mr Miller, running along the west, south-western side of the trace, all the way down as far as this point here just north of Great Haywood and then continuing across the other side of the trace. So, as I understand it, there’s already a proposal to route a haul route along that section of the railway between the points that Mr Cook mentioned.

241. THE CHAIR: Yes.


243. THE CHAIR: Next question.

244. MR MOULD QC (DfT): And then, just turning to a couple of points on visual effect – A74(17)? I don’t need to deal with the question of Great Haywood viaduct
because you know about the involvement of parish councils that I mentioned earlier.

245. THE CHAIR: Sandy?

246. MR MARTIN: Chair, just for the avoidance of doubt. You’ve pointed out the haul roads on the previous map. The intention is to use the haul roads whenever and wherever it is possible to do so, is that correct?

247. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Yes. That was our assurance to Staffordshire, if you remember, that I showed you in the context of Stone Parish Council?

248. MR MARTIN: Yes. Thank you.

249. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Mr Miller, I think you just wanted to respond on this point. This relates to the proposal to plant between those two areas of woodland.

250. MR MILLER: Yes. Our consideration in the design and through the environmental assessment that’s been carried out, we’ve looked at providing a woodland link between the two woodlands that you can see at the end of the tip of the arrow there. I think it’s fair to say that the local landowner has concerns about that. He has a commercial shoot, I believe. And I think that is something that we are looking into at the moment. So, that mitigation may well change in due course once we’ve got to grips with those issues. So, whilst we have it in our plans at the moment we may have to adjust our plans to take that into account and it may well be that proves to be beneficial from taking up your point about that open outlook.

251. MR MOULD QC (DfT): And then final point, Mr Cook pointed out rightly that the health impact assessment which forms part of the environmental statement doesn’t extend to an assessment of the potential psychological effects of generalised blight on property owners. That’s correct, isn’t it?

252. MR MILLER: It is correct. It’s a very difficult thing to take into account because of the subjective kind of nature that – the way that people perceive these sorts of projects. The health assessment that’s carried out – primarily takes up the principal effects of the scheme during construction and during operation and makes comments about that sort of effect. We then subsequently take that on through the codes of construction practice for example. And if you look at that carefully you will see that
with controls – are particularly geared around health protection. And we will be talking to environmental health officers from the local authorities in due course about the effects of construction and also about the various bits and pieces of mitigation that you have heard from us, which will deal with noise amongst other things and those sort of protections for the full operation of the railway.

253. So, it is not true to say we are not taking account of health effects. We are. But we are dealing with that in a different way. But it doesn’t take into account that perceived blight matter.

254. MR MOULD QC (DfT): And of course the project’s response to the impact of generalised blight and the remedies – to use the legal terminology – that remain available for that are the range of statutory and non-statutory compensation schemes that I’ve been telling you about over the course of recent meetings with the Committee.

255. THE CHAIR: And I must admit, I was on this evidence and previous evidence, concerned about mental health. And I push back, Mr Miller, a little bit on ‘it’s difficult to measure’. How many people were taking antidepressants 10 years ago, now? How many would you expect with this demographic to be exhibiting certain mental health problems? Whether that number is higher, whether it’s going up, whether it’s going down – I intuitively – when we’ve heard people give evidence – it is clearly an enormously stressful individual. We’ve had one petitioner previously talking about medication that they’ve taken and linking the two together. I think it might be a very useful thing to push back to HS2 and say – I’m not saying we should have a multi-million pounds study into the impact of infrastructure on mental health – but it might be worth looking at again, even if it is not normal policy. It’s something that concerns me.

256. MR MILLER: There’s certainly, through this project – Phase One and this phase – we’re getting a lot more data and we’re getting more intelligence about how this sort of project affects people. So, on the longer term there may be something which is beneficial which comes out of this project. It isn’t straightforward to go – you can’t really knock on someone’s door and try and find out whether there is a mental health issue. It doesn’t kind of work like that. And you are right, there are some demographics. There are some vulnerable groups that we do encounter and we do assess. But we don’t quite do it in the way that has been suggested by the petitioner.
But we’ll take it up as a thought –

257. THE CHAIR: I would like you to look at that again because the NHS have got that data.

258. MR MILLER: Yes.

259. THE CHAIR: You’re representing a Secretary of State for Transport I know but he’s part of a broader team. It might be, we look at that and say, actually it would be disproportionate cost or disproportionately difficult – equally it might be a very small amount of money to say that it –

260. MR MILLER: Yes.

261. THE CHAIR: – isn’t an issue or it is an issue. And if it is an issue, then how can we mitigate in future?

262. MR MILLER: Yes. Well, I think that’s a very helpful steer and we’ll take a look at that.

263. THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.

264. MR MOULD QC (DfT): That’s all I wanted to say. Thank you.

265. THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Mould. Any questions?

266. MR WHITFIELD: Sorry –

267. THE CHAIR: Sorry, Martin and then Sandy, I think. Martin first.

268. MR WHITFIELD: Sorry, Mr Mould. It’s really actually just to go back to something that was raised previously about broadband. What is the responsibility of HS2 towards people whose broadband will arrive later because of the building of HS2 as compared to those who would get it earlier? Does HS2 accept any responsibility for that delay occasioned by the fact that broadband can’t be rolled out while the building work is taking place?

269. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Well, HS2 doesn’t accept any responsibility in the sense of making alternative provision in advance of the works. That’s a matter for the
broadband provider. But what HS2 does do as I think I indicated before –

270. MR WHITFIELD: Yes, it facilitates.

271. MR MOULD QC (DfT): It must accommodate – it must deal with impacts that it has on existing utility services. And plainly, when there are plans to improve, extend telecommunications facilities which are affected by the construction or operation of the railway, then the project must make sure that the design accommodates those services. So, it if cuts across a telecommunications cable, it’s got to deal with it, and if it knows that over the course of the coming years it is proposed to roll out improved telecommunications infrastructure which is affected by HS2’s works, it must deal with that as well.

272. MR WHITFIELD: If I push on from that slightly, what communication has occurred between HS2 and the broadband providers with regard to their availability dates for broadband for this sort of area? I know these are the very areas where they’re into the last 5% and people have been waiting a long time for broadband rollout. I wonder whether or not on one side, maybe when someone wants to use HS2 as a reason for a delay, but then on the other occasion a delay –

273. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Well, the preparation of the Bill scheme was the culmination of discussions with utility providers across the full range of utilities –

274. MR WHITFIELD: Right.

275. MR MOULD QC (DfT): – including telecommunications – to ensure that appropriate provision was made to accommodate their services. If such a provider had a service that they knew was in programme to roll out during the lifetime of the Bill or during the construction of the project, then the promoter would have expected that operator to have known about it and to have raised it. We have also been promoting a series of amendments to the Bill – many of which you will find in the additional provision –

276. MR WHITFIELD: Yes.

277. MR MOULD QC (DfT): – that was published a few weeks ago. And many of those amendments are focussed on adjusting the arrangements for utility provision.
because of further information we have had from utilities providers in order to ensure
that we’re able to accommodate their needs. And as you know, the expectation is that
there will be a further additional provision promoted during the lifetime of this
Committee’s work and I dare say that you will find that some of the amendments
included in that further additional provision will also cover utilities.

278. MR WHITFIELD: So, the onus has been on the broadband utility provider to
make contact with you, rather than any individual petitioners or any residents in the area
with regard to it?

279. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Well, yes. I mean, it’s a two way process with the
utilities providers because obviously we have plans –

280. MR WHITFIELD: Sorry, I used the word ‘utilities’ to encompass broadband, did
I not?

281. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Yes. No, no, we wouldn’t have. It is very unlikely that
the planning of the Bill in this respect would have involved any significant engagement
with private individuals.

282. MR WHITFIELD: No.

283. MR MOULD QC (DfT): No. Although plainly if a farm is provided with services
which would by severed by the railway, then obviously –

284. MR WHITFIELD: Yes, the existing services –

285. MR MOULD QC (DfT): – then provision would then be made for that. And I
think we touched on that with the National Farmers’ Union and the farmer guide. Yes.


287. THE CHAIR: Sandy?

288. MR MARTIN: Yes, I had sort of a nerdy question which I’m going to get a bit of
a reputation for road junctions here. But looking at the map on P170, which was the one
I found most useful for working out what was going on when Mr Cook was describing
the problems with the roads – if you look down here, the junction that he was concerned
about between Tixall Road and Blackheath Road? I hear what Mr Mould and Mr Miller were saying. But I think that could be a difficulty especially since you will be in some cases turning right and then right again, which is always a difficult thing to do at a junction. The area where it says Kingsman Pond culvert, just to the left of that, above the Tixall Road and the area below the Tixall Road are both in the process of having large housing estates built on them. And my guess is that the pressure on that junction with vehicles is going to be quite heavy unless the road from the 513 roundabout is actually extended south. I mean – my question is partly to Mr Cook – do you know if the county council is extending that road south from that roundabout? And if not, Mr Mould, do you think there might be any merit in trying to persuade the county council that they should extend that road south from that roundabout in order to avoid all the traffic from the new housing estates going through the same junction as your construction vehicles?

289. MR COOK: Yes, I’m not aware of that.

290. MR MOULD QC (DfT): I am certainly aware that there is new housing being built in that area –

291. THE CHAIR: Exceptionally, I’ve caught the eye of a member of the audience – Mr Lefroy, you’re going to clarify?

292. MR LEFROY: Yes. That road from Beaconside here down to Tixall Road is due to be opened at a certain point when the developer of the houses has reached that stage. It is expected to be end of 2018 or 2019.

293. MR MARTIN: So, before the main construction work takes place.

294. MR LEFROY: There will be a signalled junction on that road, which is called Hydrant Way, with Tixall Road. We don’t have the exact date. But certainly by 2019, it should be open.

295. MR MARTIN: That sets my mind at rest. Thank you very much, Mr Lefroy.

296. MR MOULD QC (DfT): That was precisely what I was going to say. So, I’m very grateful.
297. THE CHAIR: Sorry to have interrupted your flow.

298. MR MOULD QC (DfT): No, no. It was said with far greater clarity than I would have achieved. So, there we are. Thank you.

299. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Any final words?

300. MR COOK: No, thank you.

301. THE CHAIR: No. No final words. The Committee are going to meet in private so that ends our public session today.