

MINUTES OF ORAL EVIDENCE

taken before

**HIGH SPEED RAIL COMMITTEE**

On the

**HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON – WEST MIDLANDS) BILL**

Tuesday, 6 January 2015 (Morning)

In Committee Room 5

PRESENT:

Mr Robert Syms (Chair)  
Mr Henry Bellingham  
Sir Peter Bottomley  
Ian Mearns  
Yasmin Qureshi  
Mr Michael Thornton

---

IN ATTENDANCE:

Mr James Strachan QC, Lead Counsel, Department for Transport  
Rona Taylor, Burton Green Residents Association  
Ms Thea Gibbs, Burton Green Church of England Primary School  
Mr Marcus Stewart, Burton Green Parish Council  
Mr Victor Stuthridge, Burton Green Village Hall Committee

Witnesses:

Mr Nick Hillard, The Greenway Trust  
Councillor John Whitehouse, The Greenway Trust  
Ms Sue Patterson, Head Teacher, Burton Green Church of England Primary School  
Ms Eileen Nisbet, Hodgetts Lane Women's Institute  
Mr Peter Miller, Head of Environment and Planning, HS2 Ltd

---

**IN PUBLIC SESSION**

## INDEX

Subject	Page
<u>Burton Green Parish Council</u>	
Submissions from Mr Stewart	4
Introduction from Mr Strachan	6
Submissions from Mr Stewart (Continued)	13
Submissions from Mr Strachan	19
Mr Miller, examined by Mr Strachan	20
Mr Miller, cross-examined by Mr Stewart	28
 <u>Burton Green Village Hall Committee</u>	
Submissions from Mr Stuthridge	29
Questions from the Committee	34
Submissions from Mr Strachan	35
 <u>Burton Green Church of England Primary School</u>	
Submissions from Ms Gibbs	42
Submissions from Mrs Patterson	47
Submissions from Ms Gibbs (Continued)	50
Submissions from Mr Strachan	52
Closing Submissions from Mr Gibbs	60
 <u>The Greenway Trust</u>	
Submissions from Mr Whitehouse	62
Submissions from Mr Hillard	72

(At 09.30)

1. CHAIR: Order, order. Good morning everybody. Welcome to the HS2 Committee, to what is a busy day with Burton Green.

**Burton Green Parish Council**

2. CHAIR: I understand that as the parish council are not here yet Rona Taylor will do the introduction. Would you like to come forward and please take your seat? You represent the residents association, as I understand it?

3. MS TAYLOR: I do, but speaking for them.

4. CHAIR: We nearly had the super substitute. Is it all right, Mr Stewart, while you are sorting yourself out, if we ask Mr Strachan just to introduce the topic. Do you want to give an introduction, Mr Strachan?

5. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): It may be helpful. I am conscious that the Committee is about to hear a number of petitions relating to Burton Green. What I was proposing to do was to give an introduction to Burton Green, to read through it. There have been some proposed changes and I can explain those to the Committee. I think it may be helpful for hearing all of the petitions over the next couple of days, so you may find it slightly longer than my normal introduction. I will try to keep it as short as possible.

6. CHAIR: Mr Stewart?

7. MR STEWART: Chair, I would like to give an introduction to Burton Green, if that is possible, as I am the first, as you say, of many petitioners from Burton Green and part of my role was to give an introduction to the main thrust of our petitions but also to describe Burton Green as a community as well. I think that would be helpful to set the context for the petitioners to come.

8. CHAIR: Okay. All right, you do the first introduction, Mr Stewart. I will then hear Mr Strachan who will just mention the changes so that we know what we are talking about so that we know what changes have occurred.

9. MR STEWART: Okay.

10. CHAIR: Then we will work methodically through the serried rank from Burton Green sitting at the back.

11. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): We certainly can.

12. CHAIR: We will be primed for that. You carry on, Mr Stewart.

13. MR STEWART: Thank you very much for allowing us to petition today. My name is Marcus Stewart. I am a parish councillor within Burton Green. I have been a parish councillor since the parish council was set up in 2012. I have been a resident of Burton Green for over 12 years. To avoid repetition and not to waste the Committee's time I intend to introduce Burton Green on behalf of the community groups and petitioners represented here today.

14. Since 2010 HS2 has been a stain and a dark cloud hanging over this community. Just looking at the first frame there, A6551, you can see the footprint that HS2 puts across the parish and the community. This footprint and stain is set to continue until 2025 during construction and beyond to the operation. May we have the next frame, please? Burton Green is a small community in a pleasant location. We have rural aspects. It is quiet. It is a quiet location. It borders on Kenilworth, Coventry and Solihull and provides an essential green gap between those urban areas. It is peaceful and has a substantial green asset, which is the Greenway.

15. Whilst it is a small community it is vibrant with a school, a village hall, a club and active community groups from which you will hear later. We are also probably the most impacted community outside London. HS2 bisects the parish and the village. I would like to thank the Select Committee for taking the time to visit us in October. We appreciate your taking our concerns seriously and hope to see a fair and just political process taking place today.

16. The next frame, please. People come to Burton Green for a number of reasons but the most important reasons are the rural aspects and pleasant location. In front of you are extracts from our parish plan, which was produced in 2013. As you can see, the majority of people respect and love the rural and pleasant nature. We also have a

population that is fairly stable. When people come to Burton Green they tend to stay there. They like it. When I moved there we only intended to stay for maybe five years. After 12 years we are still there. We like the place. A lot of people do and because of that we have an ageing population as well. We have many people who wanted to stay here and retire here.

17. The one thing that concerns everyone is HS2, as I said. When we polled people why would they move the largest single reason was HS2. The other reasons were normal reasons for moving. So, you can see that HS2 is presenting a burden to the population today and tomorrow. We will move to the next slide, please. What I want to cover here is the key summary of our petitioning status and how we intend to present that today.

18. Our most significant concern is the cumulative impact of HS2 on Burton Green. We do not believe that this has been considered in a holistic way. There are a number of approaches, and you will hear from the promoter later about the proposals around AP2 to resolve some of the issues that we raise today but the key point that we as a community feel is important is that there is a cumulative impact of construction, disruption and ongoing operation which pollutes and makes Burton Green not the place it was.

19. This cumulative impact can be addressed through the provision of a deep bore tunnel. This is something that we have campaigned for from the outset. We have the support of Warwick County Council, Warwick District Council and our local MP, Jeremy Wright, for this position. Our main thrust is that we ask for the Committee to consider looking at the options for a deep bore tunnel and addressing that looking at the work that HS2 has done and assessing the cost against the environmental, health and community impacts, which are not adequately addressed under the current assessments. So that is our main concern and that is a theme that you will get from a number of the petitioners here today. The way that we intend to address this in our petition today is that I will be leading on construction, noise, dust and traffic issues. The school and viability of a school will be taken by the school and presented later. Threats to the Greenway will be covered by the Greenway Trust who will also be attending later. I shall cover ancient woodland. The village hall will be covered by the village hall committee, who are here. Operational concerns around noise and vibration I shall

present, also the location of the autotransformer, which is too near to property, and the risk to historic sites. So, that is how we intend to proceed today, if that is okay. For all of those issues when you add them up and look at the cumulative impact, the one thing that can address those is a deep bore tunnel. That needs to be considered properly against the environment, people and costs and valued correctly. That is the end of my introduction.

20. CHAIR: That is the introduction, so we will go to Mr Strachan now. Mr Strachan, you would like to just explain some of the changes?

21. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes.

22. CHAIR: And then we will go back in a moment to Mr Stewart.

23. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Could I just show you P2516 to give you the regional context, although the Committee will be well aware of the location of Burton Green to the south of Coventry and to the south east of the areas of Balsall Common and Berkswell, which the Committee has been looking at recently. The Hybrid Bill scheme passes through Burton Green in a cut and cover tunnel, which you can see with the green and black hatch line in the middle at that section along the Kenilworth Greenway, which passes through Burton Green at that point. Can I just show you under the Hybrid Bill scheme the plans that were part of the Hybrid Bill scheme, P2183, just to give you a little more detail. The north has shifted round to the left of the page, I am afraid, but broadly speaking you can see Burton Green running in the middle of the page with Cromwell Lane running top to bottom. It joins Hob Lane, so Cromwell Lane becomes Hob Lane to the west of the route at the bottom of the page. The cut and cover tunnel under the Hybrid Bill scheme was a tunnel of approximately 620 metres in length including the porous portals on either side. That cut and cover tunnel option that finds its way into the Hybrid Bill scheme was the result of considering a number of options for the route in this location, including cut and cover tunnels, a longer bored tunnel and a number, at least seven, tunnel options taking the route through this location. Those are described in more detail in the Environmental Statement.

24. If we could go to P2183, when it comes on the screen it will become a lot clearer, I am sure, but you will see that under the Hybrid Bill scheme, Kenilworth Greenway which runs through that part of Burton Green, was diverted. There was a small

diversion of the Kenilworth Greenway to just north of Red Lane, which is shown on the plan. I will get it up on the screen, I hope, very shortly so that you can see that. The Committee will be aware, of course, that there was what is called AP1, an additional provision promoted to the Bill. That did not make any material change to the tunnel passing through Burton Green at this point. If you look at the centre of the screen one can see the cut and cover tunnel going under Cromwell Lane and Hob Lane is below. To the right of the arrow you can see a route, which is the Greenway. It was diverted effectively down the page and round that loop under the Hybrid Bill scheme. That was realigned near Kenilworth Greenway.

25. As I was explaining, AP1 did not significantly alter the cut and cover tunnel option. What it did do, and this is relevant as we will see later on, if one looks to where I was showing you the Greenway, just to the right of that there is an area notated here, 'Proposed alternative location of village hall' in the AP2 proposal. I will come back to that but all that the Committee need to know is that so far as AP1 was concerned, additional land was proposed to be taken there to divert an aviation fuel pipeline which runs in the vicinity.

26. Could I then take you to P2184? I do not know if you have that? Perhaps I should explain because there are two packs which have been made available to the petitioners. There is a set of standard exhibits which deals with Burton Green generally and a number of standard exhibits which were circulated to the petitioners and then there are some specific exhibits which respond to each of the individual petitioners. These are plans which are general to all of Burton Green, so that is probably why we are having difficulty in locating them but here it is, P2184. As a result of further work that has been undertaken in response to the various petitions and various concerns raised, the promoter is proposing to promote an additional provision 2 which does result in changes to the tunnel arrangement passing through Burton Green. I need to just explain them to you. They have a change in relation to both the operational scheme, i.e. once the scheme is up and running, and also to the construction effects on Burton Green.

27. If I can just explain the operational effects first, you will see here that this is what is proposed to be promoted by way of the additional provision. The route remains in the cutting of the Kenilworth Greenway in the same location but a number of changes are made to improve the effects on Burton Green. If I could start moving north to south, so

from left to right, if one looks at the location of the autotransformer station, that is the grey area on the plan, and move to the left of that there is an existing electricity substation in that location. If one looks just below the HS2 line, at that point is a retained cutting. The first change to note is that the Kenilworth Greenway is moved slightly further to the west and there is further vegetation and earthworks put in between the line and the Kenilworth Greenway running left to right where the arrow is currently. That is the first change, which improves the mitigation to the Greenway along that part of the route.

28. As one moves across the page to the right by the Burton Green autotransformer feeder station, if you move the arrow up to the line of green further up, there is enhanced mitigation proposed along that line of existing vegetation which borders Hodgetts Lane because in the grey area there is an important autotransformer feeder station for the line. Concerns were raised about the disability of that and under AP2 further enhanced mitigation is proposed along that line where it is notated in enhanced mitigation.

29. If we move back to the line itself below, you will see the area of blue marked 'Burton Green Tunnel North Portal'. The main change that occurs here and both to the south is that the tunnel has been extended by 100 metres, 50 metres on either side, and so there is 50 metres more in cutting further tunnel on the northern edge and 50 metres more on the southern edge. That has a number of effects. On the northern edge – I do not know if we can get up P2191; I hesitate to ask for another one – that I think will show it in a bit more detail. We can see that the blue area is the porous portal before it enters into the cut and cover tunnel and just to the right you see the notation above, 'Tunnel extended by 50 metres'. That is the additional tunnel length, so there is further landscape mitigation over that section.

30. If I can show P2192 – I hope that is the southern end – you can see a number of effects that result from enlarging the tunnel here. The tunnel is extended by a further 50 metres to the southern end with the same result of additional planting. In addition, although you cannot see it from this plan, the tunnel is tilted from the northern end to the southern. It is tilted slightly so that at the northern end it is not so deep in the retained cutting, so one does not have to dig down as deep. At the southern end it is two metres shallower and that has a number of beneficial effects. I apologise, it is two metres deeper at the southern end and that has a number of consequential effects. First,

looking at this page it enables the Greenway to pass under Cromwell Lane including equine crossings under Cromwell Lane. Previously it was the Kenilworth Greenway equine crossing. One had to come up and cross over Cromwell Lane. This enables it to pass under. It also enables the diverted Greenway to the right – remember I showed you that line, that bulge that came down – to be reduced so that the Greenway is brought in closer to its original alignment and it allows the whole of the tunnel structure and the route to sit two metres lower, which reduces the visual effects of the scheme. It also allows for additional landscaping and bundling, which has an improvement on noise effects.

31. If I move the arrow further to the right where the blue portal is shown you can see additionally that the tunnel portal buildings, which are to the right of the tunnel portal, have been shifted to the east side of the line – they were previously on the west – and the access road to the tunnel portal buildings is that red line which goes out towards Bockendon Road, whereas previously it came in from Red Lane. That means that there is now no need for access from Red Lane, which was a concern. Additionally, the earthworks and the bundling to the west of the line can be completed so that there are not any gaps at that location.

32. All of those things have a number of beneficial effects as I will explain in a moment. If we could just go back to T185, what we have done is to produce a number of sections through the route as it passes through Burton Green. I do not need to show you them all but they are available. You can see where they are marked. Take, for example, sections 5, 6 and 7, which I think you can see on page 2187. We have sections 4 and 5 here. If we take section 5, that was the section that runs broadly speaking through the alternative location for the village hall. We can see that as a result of what will happen with the porous portal in its location, the line is sunk below the area in this location at Burton Green. There is landscaping between the alternative location for the village hall, and the Greenway you can see realigned, running here with further vegetation. The HS2 main line itself is coming out of the porous portal at that point.

33. Perhaps I can just deal with the construction changes. As I said, there are operational changes that also have a number of effects on the construction in the area. If I could just show P2174, this is the Hybrid Bill scheme as it was. Can I just ask you to note the locations of three items? The Cromwell Lane satellite compound, which is to

the west of the line, is the one below that. That is the Cromwell Lane satellite compound under the Hybrid Bill scheme. To the right is the Burton Green tunnel south portal satellite compound. To the right of that is a brown area, which was a temporary material stockpile. All of those things were of concern to the residents of Burton Green. In addition you will see, although it is quite faint on this, that Hob Lane is hatched green. You recall that there was a construction traffic route which went from Kelsey Lane coming from Balsall Common along Windmill Lane and then Hob Lane and up to Hob Lane and Red Lane. That was a concern particularly as it passed the Burton Green Primary School.

34. As a result of the further work, if I can show you P2175 that shows you in thematic form what the AP1 construction traffic flows were for HGVs. On 2176 these are the changes that are proposed for the additional provision. I just ask you to note the following. First of all the Cromwell Lane satellite compound has been moved and is now adjacent to the line and served by that yellow construction traffic route, which is a line along the trace. So, it removes the need for construction traffic effectively through Burton Green or along Hob Lane. Similarly, the Burton Green tunnel south portal satellite compound, which you will recall was to the west, has been moved to the east. That is served off Bockendon Road, which is the road further up the page shown in green. That, of course, is only a rail assistance compound. I will show you the number of vehicles associated with it. It is a relatively small number of vehicles. The temporary material stockpile, which was to the west of the line behind Red Lane, has again been moved to the east of the line to remove that concern. Hob Lane is now no longer a construction traffic route. It is not proposed to be a construction traffic route, and that takes construction traffic of the type that was proposed away from the primary school.

35. I am nearly there. 2195 just deals with a question about the village hall. The Burton Green village hall is marked on this plan. It is quite difficult to see but it is marked 'Existing Village Hall'. The arrow points down exactly to that location. Under the scheme the line and the construction came quite close to the back of the village hall and it was considered that it is necessary to remove it, to demolish it. Under the Bill scheme land was included for a replacement hall. That is shown at the bottom of the page towards Hob Lane. That was land owned by the primary school and that was

available at the time, we understood, that would be suitable for a relocated village hall. We understand that it is no longer available. Now, we have proposed acquiring the land which I talked about earlier. The proposed alternative location for the village hall is just to the north of Red Lane. We put that to the trustees of the village hall. As far as I am aware there is no objection to that proposal but that is the current proposal.

36. CHAIR: We will hear later.

37. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): We will hear later.

38. CHAIR: Okay.

39. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): So, that is the alternative location proposed. I think I can probably just introduce the tunnel options report because there has been a considerable amount of work to look at the various options in this location. I am certainly not going to take you to it all but in the pack there is a document, P22051, the Burton Green Tunnel Options Report. That explains both historically the seven tunnel options that I referred to earlier in section two on page 22055 – those were the various options that were looked at post-consultation route – and then the more recent consideration on page 22057 of a short bored tunnel in preference to a cut and cover tunnel, which is what is currently proposed both under the Hybrid Bill scheme and the AP2 scheme. So, the promoter has considered a short bore tunnel option and the pros and cons of that are considered in the report from page 2207 and following. However, it may be sufficient at this stage for me just to take you to the headline points. There are some environmental benefits, certainly, of a short bored tunnel option because of the nature of tunnelling, but they are not all one way. It does mean that there are additional environmental effects at the two portal entrances to the tunnel where there is the need, for example, for 24-hour working where you are tunnelling effectively for 24 hours a day.

40. However, the costings of the two options are set out on page 2205 56. I may just need to explain this. You have on this page a summary of all of the different options and their various costs. A long bore tunnel option of the type which I understand many people in Burton Green favour is option F, which is a 7.6 kilometre tunnel option. That would be at a cost of £575 million – that is additional cost. The fourth tunnel option that I referred to a moment ago is D1, which is the short bored tunnel option through Burton

Green at a cost estimate of £85 million, and the Hybrid Bill scheme was at a cost of £28 million. That is option B of the green tunnel options in the top right-hand page. Option B1 is effectively what is now being promoted, or will be promoted, by way of the additional provisions, the 100 metre extension to the tunnel. That results in a cost of £30 million, so £2 million more than the Hybrid Bill scheme but with the additional benefits that have been identified.

41. Perhaps I can just give you an example of what is achieved through the additional provision, that is, for example, if we take the noise effects, P2211. I think this will just give you a flavour of some of the effects. I have shown you on the plan the physical changes that will result from AP2. This slide shows you some of the noise reductions that would be achieved from the additional AP2 scheme, the 100 metre extension with the slight tilt. You can see from the green column the various assessment locations. I can show you where they are but these are all locations within Burton Green along Cromwell Lane or Red Lane. A number of noise reductions are achieved with the revised design and the results for the revised design are shown in the right-hand column, noises shown are shown for day and night where the dB changes are shown, so it does result in some beneficial noise reductions from those previously shown. Of course, the green cut and cover tunnel option has construction effects on Burton Green, which are acknowledged and recognised in the Environmental Statement. Those are predominantly the earthworks needed to create the cut and cover tunnel through Burton Green. Those are predicted to be for a duration of, broadly speaking, mostly for 12 months – some are 24 months – but a period of between 12 and 24 months when the cut and cover tunnel is being constructed in that location. After that, of course, the operational effects in terms of noise are considerably reduced because it is set within the tunnel.

42. MR MEARNNS: Mr Strachan, that table that you have shown us on 2211 does not show us what the current ambient noise registration is, so you are doing a comparison with what might have been as opposed to what it currently is.

43. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): That is true. You are absolutely right, but that material is in the pack as well. I will just give you an idea of it. I have not been able to show you everything but if we could turn up 25241, just to make a little bit of sense of this – if I take it too quickly it will not make sense – P2521 shows you the assessment

ID locations. There are a large number. You will see where the tunnel is that a number of assessment ID locations have been used to model noise. It is quite difficult to try and fix those in your mind when we look at the table but a number have been taken. If we go back to the table at 25241 you will see for those assessment location levels that there are assessments both for construction base line noise, which is the table at the top of the page, and noise levels during construction at both locations. The way to read that is you can see that there are typical monthly levels. If we take 204103, the top one, they are 69 and 76. So, the typical would be 69 dB; 76 is the highest monthly outdoor noise effect from construction and that carries on down the page. If we move right across, the impact duration is shown for a period of months: 24, 11, 5, 19, 15, 1, 2, etc. The 24 period, Cromwell Lane, is the place closest to where the tunnel is being constructed where some of the properties are within the safeguarding zones in any event. That is, broadly speaking, the construction effects.

44. If you go over the page to 25242 you can see similar results for the operational effects of the railway for various locations. Some of these are not relevant to where we are looking at, such as Crackley Lane. These are for the Hybrid Bill scheme. In answer to your question earlier, I was taking you to the reductions with the result of the AP2 scheme. So, those are shown with reductions in noise effects during operation from some of the affected properties in Cromwell Lane.

45. CHAIR: Right.

46. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I hope that that is of assistance. The existing baseline sound levels are in the top part, to give you an idea of the changes.

47. CHAIR: Okay. Mr Stewart, I am sorry to interrupt you. I think that was probably useful just to go through. Please continue.

48. MR STEWART: Thank you, Mr Strachan. There is no doubt that AP2 is an improvement over the existing scheme, I am not going to deny that. However, it does not address all the issues that we have raised. It is still a cut and cover tunnel. It is still a considerable amount of construction within Burton Green. Maybe I am a bit simplistic but when I looked at the timelines for construction and in the latest evidence that the promoter presented, construction starts at the beginning of 2018 and civil works, which to me means building and digging things, and completes ultimately in 2025 with a break

between 2022 and 2023 for some periods. So, we have at least nearly four years of activities around Cromwell lane, which is the centre of the village, and then a further two years activity at the ATFS compound. So, during that whole time the centre of the village will be a building site. There will be activity, there will be building movements, dust and noise. How loud that is we have heard from the promoter. However, our concern is that this continued activity will make Burton Green a place where people do not want to move to and would like to move away from. That will have an impact on community sustainability, and our fellow petitioners from the residents association will speak more on that in detail.

49. So, that is, from our view, the construction impact and the construction timeline. We can move on to the next frame, please. Just to highlight this, this is the AP1 position. We thought it was important to make these points. I know that there have been some changes. We are pleased that the haulage route that was to go past the school is proposed to be changed but again AP2 is subject to further consultation, so there is no guarantee that that will happen. So, we feel it is important to raise our concerns around that. Again, the locations of the compounds, as you can see there, act in effectively a pincer movement around the centre of the village and that continued activity, the demolition of some of the buildings, the digging and construction of a cut and cover plus the disruption of traffic flows, temporary diversions and the like will have an impact on village life.

50. We can move on to construction noise. The promoter has identified that there will be one to two years of construction noise and vibration to at least 35 households that will be impacted. So, whether it is one year or two years, to my mind that is significant for those households and something needs to be done about that. Some mitigation needs to be put in place. As you can see from the Environmental Statement there, the proposed mitigation options for significant effects are no further mitigation identified. We would like that to be looked at to see how those families can be protected from that noise and that impact, both vibration noise and visual. Again, people came here to enjoy their lives and to enjoy the location and this is preventing them from having that enjoyment both of their property and also their gardens because more gardens will be impacted. As I have said, we are a rural community and people like to be outside. This will make their lives a misery.

51. If we move to the next slide, this highlights the AP1 construction plans. I think that I would just draw attention to the fact that we originally had three compounds planned plus significant earthworks and that construction activity is straight through the centre of the village. I will not dwell on that because we have had a discussion on it already.

52. If we move on to the next slide, I just want to make some points around the earth movements and the landscaping. We note that in the AP2 proposal the earth and materials handling facility will be located to the other side of the line but during construction the line isn't a line. It is not a barrier, it is nothing. It is just land. So, yes, it would be moving it further away from property but there will still be substantial activity there. I live in Red Lane. The soil we have there is clay. In the summer it gets very dusty. When the farmer works his fields it creates clouds of dust. I have to clean my car and clean my windows. We are concerned about the level of dust being raised by this material stockpiling. In the winter clay gets taken on to the roads by the farmer when he is moving his crop off the field. That creates dirt and mud and risks. Last year we had quite a long debate at the parish council about mud on the roads from the farmer taking his crop off the fields. So, it is a concern to us that this construction activity has all these effects that will make it unpleasant to live and work in Burton Green. We believe that when you add up all these effects – I shall keep coming back to this cumulative impact – it makes Burton Green not the place it was. It puts stress on people. It makes their lives worse and we do not feel as a community that we should have to pay this price for all this activity when there is a solution that can address this in terms of the deep bore tunnel.

53. If I might I want to stop there and talk about the deep bore tunnel options. My fellow petitioners, particularly the residents association, will be talking about that in more detail but I would like to make the following points from the tunnel options report. The original bored option, tunnel D, is costed at £179.5 million. When that construction proposal was looked at in more detail, at the same level of detail as the green tunnel options have been looked at, the costs have reduced to £85 million. That is a 50% cost reduction. So, that to me casts doubt on the costs projections of all the bored tunnel options that have been looked at at a desktop level of detail.

54. MR BELLINGHAM: I did not catch those figures. Could you just repeat them,

please?

55. MR STEWART: It is exhibit 2205 56.

56. MR BELLINGHAM: Yes.

57. MR STEWART: So, the original cost estimate for D was £179.5 million and the revised cost estimate, which was slightly just shorter in length that but only by 100 metres, would be £85 million. When you read the report, that tells you that that has been considered at the same level of detail as the green tunnel options. So, as a simple person, that would make me wonder about the other bored tunnel options and what they would look like if they were considered to the same level of detail.

58. A second point I would like to raise from this report is again it does not consider the environmental and community factors. Again, it just looks at cost. That is my point. If we go back to my original slides – I shall try not to take up too much of your time – the other area of concern, particularly with the AP1 proposal, was the use of the narrow rural lanes for HGV traffic. We have already discussed the HGVs passing the school and again the proposal under AP2 is to remove that route, for which we are grateful. But we would further propose that on AP2 HGV and materials movements are restricted to the route of the line until it met with major arterial roads, so those are the A452 north of Balsall Common and the A429 which is on the outskirts of Coventry. The line crosses both of those. For example, the proposal to use Bockendon Lane in AP2 whilst an improvement over AP1, we would still have concerns about that route because that would require it going down a narrow lane. If you want to push on to the next slide I have a photograph of that lane. That is Bockendon Lane on the right-hand side. You can see that it is just two car widths wide and it is again a rural lane. It also then leads on to Westwood Heath, which would then take it past Warwick University, which does get very congested as well.

59. So, as part of AP2 we would like you to consider looking at maintaining movement on to the route of the line for as long as possible before moving it to the roads. I have also noted there that under the existing proposal Blind Lane is also proposed to be used as a route. Again, that is a single track road. I do not believe there is a lot of traffic to go down that road but when I drive down that road I am actually quite nervous because it has hedgerows, and – you can see the frost; I took that last

weekend – it is single track. So, this is the nature of our village. This is the nature of our parish. Large lorries full of spoil, materials, iron works and all the kind of activities that will be part of the construction will have a very detrimental effect on our location. So, that is our concern around traffic routes.

60. One of the other areas that we are concerned about is the loss of irreplaceable ancient woodland and wildlife connectivity. There are a number of woods that are on the route or close to the route: Little Pools, which is surrounded by access routes and a compound; Black Waste Wood, which is near the Cromwell Lane bridge, so will be affected by the green tunnel works, and also Broadwells Wood of which at least 25% if not more would be destroyed through the construction as the line will go through that. That is an ancient wood. It has been there since the Domesday Book. It is mentioned in the Domesday Book, I believe. There are views of it there showing it as pleasant, open woodland. There is a seedbank. The proposals from the promoter to effectively dig up the soil and transport it and provide further mitigations we do not think are sufficient to protect that woodland or to protect the native species that live there. There are deer, a number of rare bat types and other animals that live within that wood, but also it is an ancient wood and you cannot replace ancient woodland with new planting. So, we have concerns about that. The only scheme at the moment that resolves that is tunnel option F, which was raised at an earlier point.

61. If we move on to the next slide, I shall not dwell on this. This was provided by Warwickshire County Council's principal ecologist. It highlights in dark green areas of wildlife connectivity and importance. It highlights the importance of those woods. Also, you might just be able to see underneath the red that there is a green line, which is the Greenway as well, which is again an important part of our environmental infrastructure.

62. We have mentioned operational noise already and some of the measures in AP2 will address that. Again, I intend to keep this brief. We have listened to other petitioners on the issues of operational noise. Firstly, we support the view of Berkswell Parish Council and Balsall Common Parish Councils who have raised similar issues that noise affects gardens not just houses and the fact that people want to use those in the summer so we need some way of addressing that. Average noise, as has been discussed here, is to my mind a nonsense, particularly with night time operation. Once you are

woken up by the noise, you are woken up by the noise. The noise modelling has been based on HS1, which we do not believe is suitable due to the speed of HS2 and the difference of that, so we are concerned about that. We are also concerned that the modelling has been done on passenger transport and we are looking for a commitment from the promoter that there will be no freight using the line because that will have a much different impact on sound. Our ask here really is that these effects are considered. We need better noise mitigation for the outdoors, monitoring throughout construction and operation and rectification where required. We support the petitions of Berkswell and Balsall Common in this area.

63. My next point is the location of the ATFS. This shows the location of the ATFS, which is the right-hand corner of the grey shape just above the line and where it is located opposite existing houses. When we originally put our petition in we were just concerned about that sort of trapezoid shape there as that was marked as ATFS. Since the promoter's response we are now concerned about the additional three super grid transformers, the switchgear buildings and the stat com which we weren't aware of in the original petition. The concern is that these border on to the edge of the village but they are opposite existing housing. We are concerned about visual impacts and noise impacts, the construction and also the ongoing operation of this electrical switchgear and infrastructure. Our ask here really is to move that as far away as you can from the properties. We believe that there is space on the site owned by National Grid and there is also space slightly further down the line the other side of the National Grid substation which could be utilised. We were very concerned that this electrical equipment was put so close to houses and I think that a number of individual petitioners who are directly impacted by that will be raising those concerns as well.

64. My next point which we raised within the petition was the risk to historic sites. There are a number of historic sites dating back to the Bronze Age but most notably some mediaeval locations within Burton Green. There is an Anglo-Romano site that has also been identified by the history group within Burton Green. They have worked closely with the Chief Archaeologist within Warwick County Council to list and explore these sites. Our simple request here really is that these sites need to be protected. There is only one that appears to be directly on the route, which is a deserted medieval village shown just outside Broadwells Wood, but our concern here is that the sites will need to

be protected. With construction activity and haulage routes there may be impacts on these sites. We just want to put it on public record that we request that the promoter works closely with the Chief Archaeologist from Warwickshire County Council and the local history society within Burton Green to safeguard and protect these sites during the construction period and provide the level of reassurance that we require to ensure that these sites are maintained and protected, providing digs where appropriate.

65. Those were the points that I was going to cover as part of the petition. I just want to remind the Committee that I and the parish council fully support the petitions of the residents association, the village hall, the school, the Greenway Trust and the numerous individual petitioners that are petitioning for Burton Green as well. As you can see, the line travels through the centre of Burton Green village. It cuts through the heart of our parish. There are a number of impacts from construction and from noise that we are concerned about and it is this cumulative impact, both through construction and operation, that we believe can only be properly dealt with and properly mitigated through the application of a deep bore tunnel. We would ask that the Committee requires the promoter to look at those tunnel options to a degree of rigour that they have looked at the green tunnel options but also to fully consider the environmental, wellbeing, community and people aspects and provide an effective assessment so that we feel as a community that we have been listened to, considered and consulted and that a just decision can be made because at the moment we do not believe that that is the case.

66. CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed, certainly for keeping to the points. Mr Strachan?

67. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I am going to ask Mr Miller in a moment to explain in brief what is involved in the construction of the cut and cover tunnel in Burton Green because I think that that may be of assistance just so that you can understand what exactly is envisaged there. Perhaps I can just deal with a few miscellaneous points whilst he is doing that.

68. CHAIR: Yes.

69. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): The first is in terms of the effect on Burton Green itself, the proposal both under the Hybrid Bill and the AP2 involved three buildings to

be demolished. That is shown on P2182, three dwellings and of course the village hall, which we will hear more about. So, that is the extent of demolition within the village for either of these two proposals. Can I just deal with the timing and sequence of works, because there was a concern raised about the duration. There is a plan – it is in a rather odd colour – at P2181 but it just gives an idea of the sequencing of the works, the construction programme. It is not very clear on this but you can see, for example, the blue area is the cut and cover tunnel. You might need to zoom in at the bottom of the page with the blue arrow. You cannot now see it on the left-hand side but it gives you the time periods. So, the cut and cover tunnel, which is the area affecting the main part of Burton Green, if you just zoom out a bit further and move across to the left, the time periods are shown. Certainly there is a period of works in the wider area of approximately four to five years. The specific areas concerned in the village itself, the tunnel portal construction, is in the period of the third quarter of 2019, through to the second quarter of 2021. I did not take you to the question of HGVs using Bockendon Road, the levels. I will just show you that and then I shall ask Mr Miller to answer one or two questions.

70. At 2176 under the revised proposals that the promoter is suggesting I explained that construction traffic is effectively routed away from Burton Green centre. You can see that here under the APT proposal, construction traffic coming along Kelsey Lane up through Waste Lane. Any traffic predominantly goes along on to the trace. There is some residual traffic that goes up on to Hodgetts Lane in order to enter the autotransformer feeder station off Hodgetts Lane but it does not carry on into Burton Green itself. To the far right-hand side the Bockendon Road traffic on the far right-hand side of the page goes up along Westwood Heath Road. The levels that we are talking about are shown on 2177. Along Hodgetts Lane it is 14 HGVs, that is combined two-way vehicle trips daily, and on Bockendon Road it is 37 combined two-way traffic flows.

71. Perhaps I may ask Mr Miller to explain what is involved in the construction of the cut and cover tunnel. There is an extract in the Environmental Statement at paragraph 2.3.16. If we can find it we will get it up but in the meantime I would just ask Mr Miller to explain what the cut and cover tunnel construction in Burton Green involved.

72. MR MILLER: I think you have heard from Tim Smart about cut and cover

tunnels in general where an open cutting would be dug from the ground and then a structure put into that cutting. It is slightly different in Burton Green because, as the parish council indicated, there is a narrow route between the houses where the Kenilworth Greenway is and that is where we are going to take up the route alignment. What we will be doing in there is providing a construction which is called top down construction, so we will have machines which will go into that area. They will dig out what is called diaphragm walls, actually creating walls in the ground to either side of the railway formation so the outer edges of the railway itself. Those walls will be created in part but not in complete sections so the works that take place will be on a sort of transient basis. So, we will put a section of walling in, move on to another area, put another section of walling in and come back and fill the gap, and what happens is – are shallow – narrow trenches are created to create these walls.

73. The void space, the gap which is left in the ground is then taken up by what's called a bentonite slurry, which keeps the walls from falling in, and then concrete is then poured into that void. The bentonite is pumped out and re-used and then the concrete is set into the ground. And so gradually, over time, the machinery will create walls on either side. It's likely that where the deepest sections of the cut and cover tunnel occur, in and around the Cromwell Lane area, that a concrete slab will be created on the ground level. Literally onto the – onto a flattened piece of ground, and then the tunnel will actually be mined out of that area.

74. Now, it's not going to be true in all cases that we'll be able to –

75. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: That system was used to make the House of Commons Car Park. Where they built the roof and then dug down and down and down.

76. MR MILLER: Yes, it's quite – these sorts of techniques are quite often used in urban areas, because of the space restrictions that you generally find with small sites in between buildings, and so here this sort of technique will be applied. So what we're doing with the cut and cover tunnel through here is trying to take up the narrowest of construction footprints, using the best available techniques for diaphragm walling, using best practicable means in our construction controls to make that as effective as possible, and to limit the likely noise that will occur at any one time outside peoples' property, and it was this sort of transient nature of the job that actually ends up building the

scheme, and in certain instances we may actually be able to mine out underneath and, if we're able to do that, then that will provide a further mitigating effect. But I should say that we're unlikely to be able to do that in all cases along that section three.

77. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Thank you, and Mr Miller, the – there was reference to the tunnel report and the consideration of the different tunnel options. In particular a concern was raised about the costings of them. Can I just get you to clarify what the report actually tells us? The costings themselves are on 2205(56) and Mr Stewart was comparing the bored tunnel option D, which is the top left hand side of the page, the costs estimate of 179.5 million, with bored tunnel option D1 which is at a cost of 85 million, and he said the difference between the two gave him cause for concern, and I just wanted to be clear that those two tunnel options are different. One is D and one is D1. We can see they're different tunnel lengths involved...

78. MR MILLER: Yes, I believe the D1 is around about something like 600 metres less in length...yes, that's right, yes.

79. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Five. Yes...

80. MR MILLER: So that's one element to it, and I understand that the arrangement for the D option required an artificial means of pumping the water out of the tunnel, whereas D1 did optimise – a line that engineers have looked at provides a natural – natural egress of the water from the tunnel. Natural drains.

81. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): There's – yes, and there's a more detailed explanation of just what you're explaining on page 2205(7) where in the tunnel report the option D1, the development of option D is it's set out in more detail and the differences explained in 3.2.2. You see there are a number of bullet points.

82. MR MILLER: Yes, that's right, yes.

83. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Reduced length, vertical alignment changes and I think over the page is the removal of the pumping station that you were talking about earlier. Could we just go back to 56, because in light of the comparative costings I just want to get your understanding? There's a concern about the environmental benefits not being taken into account. The – that is – there's quite a long section in the tunnel

report of environmental engineering benefits. Those are taken into account, as I've understood it. Is that right, Mr Miller?

84. MR MILLER: Yes. That's correct. I think I've given evidence before, I think at Balsall Common just recently, I indicated the approach that we'd take in the options appraisal, where we look at a range of factors that include the operational issues, costs and environmental issues. Wide range of environmental issues and those are balanced and sometimes that's qualitative, using our expertise, of a wide range of expertise, as I've explained before. We bring all of that to bear, together with costings and estimates of construction programming, that sort of thing.

85. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): And can I just ask you, Mr Miller, just to address this – these two different figures. The £30 million for the improved cut and cover tunnel, which is option B1, and the short bored tunnel option, which I know is not even the preferred option of the Parish Council. But the short bored tunnel option D1, which is the cheapest short bored tunnel option, which is 85 million – so it's a £55 million difference – in terms of what is actually achieved by way of environmental benefits, or other benefits between those two options: The B2 option as compared with a short bored tunnel option, the report concludes those – such benefits don't justify the cost. But can you just explain why that is the case?

86. MR MILLER: Yes, I think you could summarise it in a sense that the bored tunnel, I think as the Parish Council have indicated that – although they want the longer tunnel – but the short bored tunnel would overcome some of the traffic effects and the construction effects that would occur with the B1 type of scheme. Having said that, the construction effects of B1 scheme, I think as you set out, in the way that the transport is going to now take place with that scheme, the effect on the centre of the village of Burton Green has diminished considerably, with probably only a small diversion of Cromwell Lane now left within the village and the exception of the diaphragm walls, as I've indicated. Although we think that that might work in a different way.

87. So what I would say for construction is that there's probably a marginal difference, although a bored tunnel would be out of sight and out of mind. The other benefit, I suppose, of the bored tunnel option is it would avoid the disruption of the Kenilworth Greenway. But in the B1 scheme that is replaced and with greening over

the cut and cover tunnel what you sort of get is a reinstated link, in a different way, with the various footpaths that we described on previous occasions, linking the sort of north of the village where the existing village hall is through to where the proposed new village hall be, on that field plan, which is just to the north of Red Lane.

88. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Does...

89. MR MILLER: So, essentially, I would say that the environmental effects are marginal when you look at it like that, and justifying the 55 million additional cost, my view is that's not good value for money.

90. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Can I just ask you then to just deal with the ancient woodland that was concerned about potential loss of ancient woodland. In the scheme itself there is a translocation for the effects of part of the ancient woodland. Shown P2184... I'm sorry. Actually I can get it from the folder. I just wanted to check one other thing here. That's very helpful. Got it. Thank you.

91. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: It does, by the way, looking for 2205(56) in our folders. They come after 2210 rather curiously...So...

92. MR BELLINGHAM: It's on the screen now, so thank you.

93. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I've got it. Yes, I think some of the photocopied pages have got into the wrong order. So – but I just wanted you to deal with some of the briefly – with the concern about the ancient woodland. We can see the ancient woodland's not actually marked on this particular plan, but it's just off to the right, where, 'Tunnel portable access road' is marked. That is part of Broadwell Woods.

94. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: That's right, yes.

95. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): And in – the ES describes that affecting the translocated area of planting. If you could just explain where that is.

96. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Can I just pause you there? Can you put translocate into plain English? You aren't actually moving the trees and the shrubs are you?

97. MR MILLER: No. What we'll do is we'll take down the trees. We will cut down the trees. So you won't get the big trees back. There's no question about that. If

the tree root system is able to be moved we will root ball that tree and move that, and we will move the ancient woodland soils, and we'll carefully move those soils to a reception site, and what you do is by moving the soils carefully you're taking the biodiversity within the soils with you to that new site.

98. It has to be done very carefully. But we – there is a site on the A2, M2 widening scheme which has formed part of the High Speed 1 build scheme, at Cossington Woods, which I visited and it does seem to me that the woodland – the tree balls have grown back up to create coppiced woodland, which is species rich and, in that case, has helped promote a proliferation of dormice, and it's obvious from the ground flora that the indicator species of ancient woodland in that case: bluebells, anemones and that sort of thing – sort of things that you've seen on the photograph here from the Parish Council – have all taken. So providing you do this carefully, and you do it well, then you're able to maintain the species diversity, and that's what we're trying to get out of the translocation. You can't bring back the sawn trees, I'm afraid.

99. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: But it's a good effort to get the ecology in the new place pretty well what it was at the old place?

100. MR MILLER: Yes. Yes, that's right. So what we're proposing on this drawing here, if on the right hand side of the drawing you can see, just between High Speed 2 and Kenilworth Greenway there's lots of green dots in there. To the north of that, sort of partly to do with landscaped screening and to the south of that patch, where the blue balancing pond is, that's the sort of reception site for the ancient woodland translocated soils. So what we're trying to do there with the species mix in the landscaping scheme, although that's not ancient woodland, you would bring in similar natural species to the ancient woodland species that you would end up planting to supplement the scheme, and similar to the ancient woodland, and the idea there is that you would then provide something which is a lot greater than what you're actually taking down, and that was the evidence that I gave to – in response to Warwickshire's – who have led on the ecology type of work. And then, when you look at the scheme, and you can't really see it on this plan...

101. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I think it's at – the best...

102. MR MILLER: Further south...

103. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): 2210 I think is a better slide to show...This is actually the hybrid bill scheme, and I'm not sure that it materially changes to the south at AP2.

104. MR MILLER: So then what you try and do with the railway itself, you recognise the railway, the new railway, as being a linear feature, and we've – you'll probably have to zoom in on some of these things – but you can see that there are various areas of additional woodland planting and hedgerows along the line of the route. We tend to put the hedgerows in where we're trying to maintain agricultural fields. We tend to put in woodlands where there are odd bits of land, the sort of things you've heard about before. But you can see that by using the linear feature of the railway we can joint up other areas of existing woodland, and if you track this through you can see the symbols on the Ordnance Survey base of the other ancient woodlands – sorry, woodlands and ancient woodlands – through this section. So you get down towards Brackley and there's woodland there, and you can see that the railway's actually supplementing these woodlands and creating something which is sort of bigger than the sum of the parts.

105. Then, if you go back to the Warwickshire's connectivity plan, which the Parish Council have shown, you then sort of see that the railway has the opportunity, presents the opportunity, for joining up those dots which were otherwise, in the existing situation today, islanded within these areas of agricultural land. So what we're trying to do with the landscape and ecological plan is to maximise the opportunity for biodiversity and the natural environment. Albeit that we're introducing a new railway, a new industrial feature, across that landscape.

106. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Finally, can I just ask you, Mr Miller, to look at the autotransformer feeder station that was raised? There is, at P2193, a plan showing the autotransformer feeder station, and then the location of some sections. I explained, in the introduction, that part of the AP2 provision is to enhance the planting along the existing woodland that's located along Hodgetts Lane.

107. MR MILLER: Yes.

108. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): And the autotransformer feeder station is located next door to the electricity sub-station, which is to the left.

109. MR MILLER: Yes. That's one of the sort of natural points where we would naturally take the power off to – power up the trains on High Speed 2.

110. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): But we see here a number of sections. Just to give an idea of what the visual effects would be of the transformer station. Section 1 is the one closest to properties on Hodgetts Lane, which is to the right.

111. MR MILLER: Yes.

112. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): And if we could just look at P2194, just to understand the relationship between Hodgetts Lane and the nearest source of buildings there. Section 1 we can see the top. Hodgetts Lane is shown on the right hand side. There is some – there are some green – large green trees, which I think is the existing woodland, existing trees, and then, in between those, proposed mitigation tree planting to thicken the tree planting visual screening along that side. Then there's the access road within the transformer feeder station, and then we see switch gear equipment buildings shown in profile. Section 2's further away from the site. Switch gear buildings in Section 2, and then the SuperGrid autotransformers in Section 3, which again further away.

113. MR MILLER: That's right. Yes. Because through those sections, as you've gone through that sort of sequence, there is need to sort of level the site as it goes towards the existing electrical feed. Transformer station, excuse me. So that all the equipment's on the level, and then our equipment, the sort of lesser of the equipment, is the closest to the village, and then, as we've indicated, around that corner of the village, where the village hall – the existing village hall is, and the access road, or the bit in between the access road and Hodgetts Lane, we'll supplement that with further planting, and I think, just to the south, there's further built up landscape earthworks, which is similar to what's around the national grid station just further north.

114. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): The final matter raised by Mr Stewart was the question of protection of heritage sites. I think I can deal with this briefly, in the sense that there is a specific provision in the Code of Construction Practice which deals with the way in which working will take place to protect cultural heritage. That's Section 8 of the draft Code of Construction Practice, and sets out general measures that will be employed to minimise effects on cultural heritage, both designated and non-designated

assets, and there's an information paper, E8, which sets out in more detail what is required. It's at – because there was a concern raised, Mr Miller, about ensuring that the Promoter worked with the relevant archaeology offices.

115. MR MILLER: That's correct, and I think further to that that there are provisions within the bill, and we have an environmental memorandum with English Heritage, and that's – that sets out similar processes, and all of that sets out similar processes and practices that occurred on High Speed 1 that are occurring now on Crossrail, and are accepted best practice for managing the heritage environment. I think it's fair to say that we're not directly affecting the heritage sites which have been highlighted, but we obviously recognise, through these practices, that not everything's accurate on plans, and we may come across something, but we'll manage that in the appropriate manner.

116. CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr Strachan. Mr Stewart, do you have any questions of Mr Miller?

117. MR STEWART: Yes, I do have a question of Mr Miller actually. You talk about the relocation of the soil and the root balls. I'm just intrigued, how do you store them between the time you remove them and the time that they get re-planted? Because looking at the construction timeline here, there's two and a half maybe three years activity in Broadwell Woods, and I would imagine that you would have to clear the path first before you start re-instating in other parts of the line. So I'm just intrigued to how that would be stored.

118. MR MILLER: One of the things that will happen on this project, which may come as a bit of a surprise to everybody, is that the environmental work is most likely to take the lead for – prior to the construction works taking place. Now it's not going to be true in all places, because it depends on the sort of formation that we have for the railway, but as I understand it on the High Speed 1, or the A2, M2 widening scheme for the translocation of the soils, that when the soils generally were moved the trees were cut, the root balls were formed, and then the trees, those root balled trees, were moved almost immediately to those receptor sites and then there was a drainage plan and a watering plan that was put in place to make sure that those trees, or the roots, took in those soils. One of my team actually worked on that scheme, so we have a very good knowledge of how to do this, and this is the sort of thing that we'll employ when we

look at the soils translocation site. I don't have a detailed plan for that at the moment, but that will come in due course.

119. MR STEWART: Okay, thank you.

120. CHAIR: Any more questions at all, Mr Stewart?

121. MR STEWART: No, that's fine, thank you.

122. CHAIR: Any brief final points before we move onto the next petitioner?

123. MR STEWART: I think my very brief final point is that the cumulative impact needs to be considered. I think you've got that point.

124. CHAIR: Okay, thank you very much.

125. MR STEWART: Thank you very much.

126. CHAIR: And right, now we move onto the Burton Green Village Hall Committee. We've already heard from Mr Strachan, he's given a little bit of introduction about – and mentioned the Village Hall. Who's going to kick off? You, Mr Stuthridge? Or...

### **Burton Green Village Hall Committee**

127. MR STUTHRIDGE: I'm quite happy to kick off.

128. CHAIR: Okay.

129. MR STUTHRIDGE: So we're on A6401. So Burton Green Village Hall being a registered charity, and today I am acting as the Petitioner. Eileen Nisbet is my expert witness and, if we need some clarification on the status of the Village Hall as a charity, or about the accounts, then I'd like to call on Peter, who's our treasurer.

130. CHAIR: Is he the worried looking man at the back?

131. MR STUTHRIDGE: The man hiding behind me, yes. So, to prevent repetition, then we're going to concentrate on one thing: The access and traffic problems have already been quite well covered. My understanding there'll be some more digging on

the post tunnel, the deep bore tunnel. Of course, if the deep bore tunnel came into effect then it would remove all our problems, which – with reference to the Village Hall. Eileen's withdrawn her petition, which was on behalf of the WI to join with us, because her concerns directly reflect, and she's represents one of our very regular users of the Hall, so she will give you some good understanding of what it means to the community, and that's going to be our focus. We're going to focus on the community. Next slide please.

132. We're on the northern border of the county of Warwickshire. The northern half of Cromwell Lane is still in Coventry, and historically the Warwickshire Solihull border ran down the middle of Cromwell Lane. We were fortunate enough a few years ago, when the border did run down, to have a cricket match, Solihull against Warwickshire. One side of the lane against the other. That didn't matter because the community doesn't – and it's never been restricted by the artificial boundaries which have been put down by local authorities. Next slide please.

133. My personal background is I've lived in Cromwell Lane for 37 years. My three children went to mother and toddler at Burton Green Village Hall, and then to Burton Green Village School. I'm a committee member, my wife's a trustee. So there's no personal axe for me to grind, because I actually live closer to the present railway line, which is the line from Birmingham to Euston. My concern is the future of the Burton Green community. Next slide please.

134. MS NISBET: Okay, I'm Eileen Nisbet and I'd like to bring a sort of personal human view to the construction of HS2. I'm President of Hodgetts Lane Women's Institute in Burton Green and a long-term member of the community. I've been resident in our village for 46 years, and taught at Burton Green School for over 30 years. So you can see I'm firmly entrenched in the community of Burton Green. I've watched children grow up there and return to live there and have families of their own.

135. Hodgetts Lane Evening WI was formed in 1967 by a group of young mums and wives living in Burton Green and has met at our village hall since that time. Previous to this there was an afternoon WI. After 46 years we still have many of those original members. When a new village hall was needed some 30 years ago we worked really hard to raise money to build and furnish that new building. Our group is part of a

national federation, which is the largest voluntary organisation for women in the UK.

136. The WI is naturally diverse, and is about inspiring women by offering them opportunities to access a rich source of experiences, knowledge and skills. We have a voice and are able to use that voice in our annual resolutions. I'd like to use that voice today, on behalf of my members.

137. Many of our members come from further afield than just our village. We have members from Kenilworth, Balsall Common and Coventry. We're a really popular WI who meets in a comfortable, accessible village hall. We've been promised a new village hall. That's good. But will our members be able to access – easily access – our new meeting place, through all the turmoil and upheaval of HS2 construction?

138. If our ladies find road access difficult we could see our WI numbers drop. If the WI struggles for numbers we won't be able to offer the same opportunities to our members due to the reduced number of subscriptions. Many of our members are elderly now, and have been really badly affected already with the stress and worry of the proposed HS2 so close to their homes. We need you to hear the voice of Hodgetts Lane WI today so that I can reassure our 50 members that you view our village of Burton Green in a humane way. We are more than just a point on a map, which has had a line drawn straight through it, cutting up and devastating our community. It may help, of course, if that line is the line of a deep bore tunnel. Thank you.

139. MR STUTHRIDGE: Slide 7 please. As Eileen has quite eloquently stated, we draw on a much wider area. So when people refer to the community, community we serve is much wider than that contained within the parish of Burton Green. We've got people from all walks of life, and we embrace people who have aspiration to develop themselves or even just to socialise. Slide 8 please.

140. Incidentally, it's a photograph taken from my house. So I live far closer to the present railway line than the proposed railway line. The thing about the facility we already have is HS2 as a facility has something that the community wouldn't require. It's of zero benefit. We're already extremely well served. Next slide please.

141. As for some examples of – or a sample of the usage the Hall gets at the moment, slide 642. As you can see, if we take the last complete month that was available to me

at the time, November, it's extremely well used. Three and four times a day. This analysis would come out to something like 82 regular bookings, some weekly some monthly, and 12 spot bookings, which are often for children's parties. Can we go back to 640(10) please. You've also got copies of the accounts up to September 2014. If you were to look at these accounts you'd see that bookings, and the revenue from bookings, accounts for 72% of our income, and events we run as money raising events, about 28% in the last full audited year. Next slide please.

142. Linking the two things together, if we looked at the accounts and the top five revenue generators in terms of how much money they contribute, the top five user groups are all run by people who are not resident within the parish of Burton Green, again demonstrating the wider area we serve. The community we serve is much bigger than the parish of Burton Green.

143. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Is this partly because when the parish boundaries were drawn they weren't drawn right? Old Burton Green got left out, or parts of it, didn't it?

144. MR STUTHRIDGE: Somebody has to be on the edge. We're on the edge. Next slide please. So our reserves, in comparison to September 2009 accounts, and this is 2014 accounts. In 2009 we were quite unaware of the HS2 situation, so all I'm trying to indicate here is that since we've known about it we realised there's a big chunk of expense coming, and so we worked quite hard. We've renamed the development fund – sorry, renamed the reserves as now a development fund, and we're pretty much on target for what we aimed for then, which was to get £50,000 in the bank by the time we'd got to start spending money. Next slide please.

145. So we've surveyed the community, quite naturally. We are in the situation where we've got £41,000 in the bank, a turnover of £16,000 a year, approximately, as shown in the last year a surplus of £6,000. Because of where we are and where we live there's little chance of us getting grants under normal circumstances. Next slide please.

146. So our petition concerns are continuity, the cost of relocating, the possible loss of income during the construction phase – and this has not been addressed in response to our petition, and there's possibly a loss of income whilst we rebuild the thing, and that recovery period from the construction cost. And the Committee are all unpaid

volunteers. Sorry, you had done the correct thing and moved on, so I didn't – and, as most of these volunteer groups work, people take their turn in working on the committee and helping keep the facility there for future generations. Next slide please.

147. Now we've adopted, from the beginning, or from the announcement, a very positive attitude to the change. We've actively sought dialogue with the Proposer, and we've already spent hundreds of hours on this project. Next slide please.

148. We were planning a new kitchen in 2009, beginning of 2010. Reserves became development fund, as I said, and we've conducted surveys to help with planning. Next, please. We have up to date from HS2 a promise for a like for like replacement, subject to a reasonable test, and this is – the word, 'Reasonable' is in every letter, or all three letters we've had from HS2, for anything in writing. And it - really a lot of it hangs on what's the word, 'Reasonable' mean? And is it reasonable to disrupt this community in the way it's going to be disrupted? And, at the end of that, turn round and say, 'Well you can have what you've already got.' Next slide please.

149. So we would like minimum disruption, and we do appreciate that some of the proposals in the AP2, yet to be confirmed additions, might well satisfy that. Not even had full time to read them yet, as they only arrived on 23 December. We need support to relocate to a site of our choosing. Now, at the moment we have twelve options under consideration, of places to relocate to in the village. Eleven of those are on greenbelt land, and so will require us to negotiate with Warwick, that the release of the greenbelt was only one of the twelve that we're looking at is actually already got a B1 status.

150. So – and we particularly would like a legacy in the village, so that we can look back and say, you know, 'At least that was an improvement. At least HS2 going through the middle, we came out with something at the end of it.' And we'd like help from you to achieve those aims. We've always viewed it, and always suggested in meetings with HS2, that this could be a particularly good public relations effort on their behalf, as to be seen to be doing something positive. And the last slide, please. Which is to say thank you very much for listening.

151. CHAIR: Okay.

152. MR STUTHRIDGE: And have you any questions?

153. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): No, that's quite straightforward and I understand your concerns and of course most of us, I think, have been in the Village Hall.

154. MR STUTHRIDGE: Yes.

155. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): We've had our picture taken by the sign.

156. MR STUTHRIDGE: Good.

157. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Ian.

158. MR MEARNNS: Yes. I mean one of the things that strikes me, I mean the community, when I visited, there's a bit of a linear community along the main road. Is it Cromwell Lane?

159. MR STUTHRIDGE: Yes.

160. MR MEARNNS: Yes. And you've got – is the community centre itself on Hodgetts Lane?

161. MR STUTHRIDGE: The Village Hall's currently situated there, yes. I mean...

162. MR MEARNNS: Yes, yes. I remember from Mr Strachan's presentation earlier on that there is a proposal for an alternative site on Red Lane? Correct?

163. MR STUTHRIDGE: Correct.

164. MR MEARNNS: Now, the thing that strikes me about that is, you know, in terms of it being a linear community, the current location's kind of closer to the heart of the linear community, whereas the Red Lane site seems to be much further to the south, towards the edge of the community. I mean is that a particular problem, from your perspective?

165. MR STUTHRIDGE: We've got to develop a sifting –

166. MR MEARNNS: I mean when it comes to HS2 itself it would be the other side of the tracks for many, wouldn't it?

167. MR STUTHRIDGE: Yes. But in both cases, in terms of when the Bill was

presented, the Hybrid Bill was presented, there was no consultation with us, and no indication, before the presentation of the Bill, that they were going to put us next to the school...

168. MR MEARNNS: Right.

169. MR STUTHRIDGE: And then again there has been no consultation, no discussion, until I saw the leaflets, two days before Christmas, to say that now the railway's being moved, 'You're now going to be plonked there'. I mean, that's what we need, is the ability to choose where we're going to end up.

170. MR MEARNNS: Okay, thank you very much.

171. CHAIR: Mr Strachan, can you say a little bit more about the replacement village hall...

172. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Absolutely.

173. CHAIR: And what is proposed. I mean is it exactly a like for like? Or is there some scope for improving, in terms of the design, in kitchen, in things like that? I mean I presume you don't want to provide indoor swimming pools and things like that, but you're actually going to provide something pretty decent?

174. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes. Can I first of all just say that the – from the outset, it's been recognised that if the scheme requires the land where the current Village Hall's located, that the scheme wanted to ensure the provision of an alternative village hall. So that has being part of the thinking, and I just want to – and a lot of the presentation was about the importance of the village hall, and that's not in any way disputed. Can I just show you, in the correspondence, what has been offered? It is a flexible offer, because we recognise very much that the local community will want to have a say in where the location is. We have identified a potential location, and we are awaiting comments from the community. But can I just show you how things have slightly developed?

175. A646 is a letter that was written on 1 October 2014 to Ms Wall, regarding the Village Hall, and there are a number of other letters that precede this, where the principle of a location – relocating was recognised. But the position was summarised in

the bullet points: that the HS2 will meet the cost of buying the plot of land, the construction of a replacement village hall an equivalent size to the existing, including, of course, all the same number of car parking spaces. The agreement to pay the professional fees of the Trustees who want to identify the location, design the new village hall and project manage the construction, and those can be paid direct.

176. They – the letter identifies that the scheme had identified a plot of land. At that stage, that was the school plot. But, very much recognising the ability for the Trustees to come forward and talk to us if they had a preferred location, and Mr Stuthridge has referred to a number of locations that they're considering. Can I reiterate that invitation: If they do have alternative locations that they want us to help them look at we are very happy to do that. We're not actually sure what locations are being referred to.

177. In the meantime, we have identified a location which, to us, looks eminently suitable, and can I just show you comparatively where it is compared with the existing Village Hall? That's P2195, and I think I showed you this earlier, but just to – in light of Mr Mearn's questions – you can see the existing Village Hall was off Hodgetts Lane to the left of Cromwell Lane, on that plot where the arrow is pointing. The land for the school was down below, at Hob Lane, which I've showed you. The site that we've identified as potentially suitable is just off Red Lane. So I note the point about it being a linear settlement, but it's not, in correlation terms to Hodgetts Lane, where it previously was, it's certainly not on Cromwell Lane but it's not distant from it.

178. However, we have put it forward as a suggestion of an alternative site, and there are a number of potential advantages of a hall in that location, because you'll see that, in fact, behind the hall is the Kenilworth Greenway. There's a footpath that actually lies to the left of the proposed alternative location for the village hall was a dotted line. That's a footpath that runs up to the Kenilworth Greenway. Under the operational scheme the Kenilworth Greenway will run right and left. To the left, of course, it runs over the cut and cover tunnel connecting back into the community. So we can see a number of potential benefits of a village hall in that location.

179. We're not, in any way, trying to set it in stone or prescribe it for the community. It's important that they come forward and make their views known, and can I just – the

letter we sent makes that clear, and if it's not clear I emphasise it. 2247(1). 2247(1). Just to explain the status of that, what we are – what we explained in the 19 December letter to Mr Stuthridge, E3, the third paragraph, 'We are clear we are willing to work with the Village Hall committee to assist them with the replacement. We must be sure an alternative is available and other locations be identified. In light of the concerns raised regarding the location proposed within the Bill...' that was the school location, 'We're now proposing the alternative site, which we're prepared to promote by way of the AP2 provision, but I reiterate...' the author of the letters says, 'The position still remains we're willing to discuss alternative locations with the community if that is the preferred option.' So, in sum, we are doing our very best to identify a suitable location. We think we've come up with one which would actually result in some significant benefits, when you look at the scheme as a whole, but we're not, in any way, seeking to dictate the solution, and the – we are, very much, willing to listen to any comments about that or alternative locations if the hall has those.

180. CHAIR: Sir Peter.

181. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Assuming things went on as planned, when would the hall site be needed by the scheme?

182. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): If I could I get the precise date for you...or certainly what is – this letter goes on to make clear, I reiterate this, 'The construction of the alternative village hall can be put in place in a way that ensures there isn't a period of time...'

183. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Seamless move.

184. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Exactly. 'A period of time without a village hall.'

185. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Okay. So we can presume then the loss of income issue which came up would evaporate?

186. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): That is our objective.

187. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Objective. Secondly you said, in effect, I hope you'll say it in terms, that the Promoters will come to Burton Green, will talk with the Hall users and Trustees and, preferably, will have the planning council there as well,

because some of the potential sites wouldn't automatically be...

188. MR STUTHRIDGE: This one is as well.

189. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Okay, so it is – that's something you could say, which I think would make us happy, and would then give those who've come to us today the chance of getting on with trying to work out whether any or all of their 12 ideas might work.

190. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes, can I clarify something in – the question that's just put. The – under the proposal that we're promoting, we would promote with an additional provision where the land is then identified for a village hall. That comes with deemed planning permission.

191. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: I accept...

192. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): That's the advantage, and why we've been encouraging a response on that location, or an alternative location. Because if we can do it in that way, it obviously will facilitate the process.

193. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Indeed. If the planning council know that the Promoters, with Parliament's assent, can actually give planning permission for what's proposed, they will know it's going to happen anyway, and therefore I think you might find that they'd be willing to avoid – you may still have to have the AP, but at least the village hall people will know what is going to happen, and what would be best. But I...

194. MR STUTHRIDGE: There's one other small point on that, is that isn't that field part of the pipeline relocation part?

195. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): It is.

196. MR STUTHRIDGE: So how does that impact on choosing that as a site? Again we're closing down this ability to move. The window in which we've got to move.

197. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Well the pipeline diversion is a realignment of the pipeline so it crosses directly the route of HS2. It currently, if it were left in place, it would have a sort of diagonal crossing. So that can easily be achieved, and the construction of a village hall, in that location, which is why we've identified it. But

rather than I can explain those things, that's certainly the sort of dialogue that can take place, and that invitation to that dialogue we set out in correspondence, but I'm quite happy to reiterate that we do want to talk to the Village Hall Trustees about this location or any other alternative location they would like to see. Because, as I've said, it's easier if they can identify those for us as soon as possible, in order to take it forward by way of additional provision if that's...

198. MR STUTHRIDGE: Can I –

199. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): The advantage I've identified. The commitment that's already been put into the exhibits was a replacement village hall will be ready for use before the existing Village Hall is to be demolished, and that recognises the concern about ongoing – ongoing income.

200. I should just add one other thing, because it cropped up. The Cromwell Lane that runs between – connecting the community. Under the proposals Cromwell Lane is diverted whilst the cut and cover tunnel's being constructed so that Cromwell Lane is not severed during the construction, so there is the ability to pass to and from the community. There is a period of tying in the diversion, overnight tie ins of the type we've heard about previously, where you literally have to make the connection, the diversion, so that the traffic can continue to flow. That's the extent of it. Those sorts of tie in closures. But the idea is, throughout construction, to have a route through Cromwell Lane and then to reinstate Cromwell Lane at the end of the construction period. So that just deals with the point of concern about getting to the village hall.

201. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: We're grateful. Can I just leave one more point on the record? The commitment by the Promoters is for an equivalent village hall. It may be that that could be done by saying, 'What would be the cost of doing it?' then allow the village hall committee to have a discussion about how that money could be used to create the kind of hall that they would best want, given the change in circumstances, and I think I'd like to believe that were they to want to put some extra money in to make it extra things to the hall, that that would not be a difficulty?

202. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I can't see why that would be a difficulty, and I see that would be a perfectly logical way forward, to deal with it in that way, and, as I said, the commitment was to, for example, pay for costs of architects. To allow that sort of

productive discussion to take place.

203. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Thank you.

204. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): So I was going to take you to a slide where the commitment, or the identifying point about a replacement being provided before the other one's demolished is. But I don't think it's necessary...

205. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: We saw that before, so... I just want to make sure that there's a sensible flexibility and opportunities for them getting the best they can, without the public purse being put to a greater expense than is necessary for the replacement hall.

206. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes...

207. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Thank you.

208. MR MEARNES: Could I, sorry, there is an issue from my perspective. You know, just looking at the position, the location, and that is loss of location within the community. I mean, you know, you're taking it from the heart of the Burton Green community and putting it on the edge, and I think some consideration should be given to, you know, actual loss of location within the value of the property.

209. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Well, I totally understand the point. The – we've – we – I say, 'We', I mean those who've looked at it in more detail than me have considered that the proposed location is a good one, and recognising the nature of the community and where the scheme will – where the village hall will sit, within the wider scheme, once it's completed. But there is plenty of room for discussion about that if the contrary view is taken. What is important though, can I just reiterate, for our perspective it is important to have those discussions with the trustees as soon as possible. Because, as I indicated, the additional provision, identifying the location of the village hall, brings with it the deemed planning consent necessary to allow the scheme to go ahead, and so it is important for those discussion, and I do invite – I don't see there's any difficulty in having those discussions, but they should take place and the trustees can let us know their thoughts: on this location, or an alternative. So we can...

210. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Well you've got the Trustees, you've got the parish

council, and I wouldn't ignore the planning council. I think that'd be unwise.

211. CHAIR: So, essentially, your undertaking is to provide what they have at the moment but, given 30 years have gone by since the last village hall were built, if there were extra toilet facilities, or slightly bigger kitchen, or more environmental heating system, or whatever, that that would be something that no doubt would be possibly swept up in the proposal?

212. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes. Though plainly the Trustees have already indicated that they will set aside money of their own which they wish to invest in the village hall, and there's no reason why that sort of investment, if they wish to make it, can't be coordinated with the reinstatement.

213. CHAIR: But also we're designing a building from scratch, it's, you know...

214. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Certainly. Well there are opportunities from having – I know they may not see it that way, but there are opportunities in having a – design new building from scratch in optimising the design for its use.

215. MR THORNTON: I'm thinking about LED lighting, to get electricity cost right down, and all that sort of thing.

216. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I imagine those will be required under building regulations or, in any event, by the architects or others in ensuring we comply with energy efficient requirements.

217. CHAIR: Okay, final comments from you, Mr Stuthridge?

218. MR STUTHRIDGE: Not really, other than to say we've always been open to discussions. If anything, the difficulty has been getting HS2 to come and discuss with us, and there is an impression that at times we're talking to the Indians and not the chiefs. So we're not actually discussing it with people that can make decisions.

219. CHAIR: Okay, good point, and I'm sure that's taken on board. Right, thank you very much. We're now going to move on, but we're going to jump to Burton Green Church of England Primary School, who I understand have to get back to make sure everything's going alright at the School?

## **Burton Green Church of England Primary School**

220. CHAIR: We had a little chat outside your school. And you put us straight.

221. MRS PATTERSON: In the nicest possible way.

222. CHAIR: Absolutely. You raised a number of concerns, which no doubt you're going to raise today. Who's going to kick off? Are you, Ms Gibbs?

223. MS GIBBS: I'm – I was a chair of governors until September this year. I was a governor for seven years before that, and chair for four. So I submitted the petition and have continued to support the School in this way and, whilst now associate governor and Sue Patterson here is the head teacher of school and has come as a witness, to explain some of the detail that I'll be talking about.

224. Thank you for the opportunity today to talk about our petition, and it's useful to know that you can visualise the School as well, when I talk about it. I'll briefly introduce the School, and then I'm going to talk about the key areas of concern that we have. The school is a valuable asset at the heart of our village. It strengthens and rejuvenates the community through bringing families into the village and integrating the children into the village life. We have around 100 pupils, and they're drawn from Burton Green itself, but also from surrounding areas, in all different directions. So people are travelling in to Burton Green on a daily basis from all the different roads into the village.

225. There are around 15 staff if you include all the staff and ancillary staff as well as teaching staff. A number of volunteers come in every week, and also we have a very active Friends of Burton Green group which puts on social events and fund raising events. So it's a very full community. Whilst it only has 100 pupils it's a very full community and, given the scale of our community, it is a key part of it.

226. The School is also consistently rated as good by Ofsted, recently only last year and, as a result, the places have always been sought after. There's an intake of 15 pupils in reception year each year, and those 15 places have always been filled and over-subscribed. We've had no difficulty, ever, in recruiting pupils into the School and families into the School community.

227. So this underlines the fact that the School is part of the community, integrally affected by the demographic and environmental changes that are happening in Burton Green, and proposed to happen in Burton Green and beyond, and cannot be separated from that community. So whilst it might be physically a little bit down the road, it's very much part of the community as if it was in that heart where the village hall is. And I should also note that it's already – the School is already feeling the effects of HS2. Because families have already had their houses purchased by HS2 Limited and have already left the area, and that's obviously meant a drop in our roles. So those are fears that we had talked about happening, and they are already happening, as of this year.

228. Our key areas of concern both cover direct effects on the School and indirect effects on the School by being part of the Burton Green community. We have been grateful to receive some assurances on some of our key points, but there are still much left to be – that has been unaddressed, and that we would like to highlight for you today.

229. First of all, the village hall replacement. I won't go on about that. I was very pleased to see that the hall has been moved in the AP to a new site. If that can, in fact, be delivered. The site that was proposed, on the School land, has never been available, has never been appropriate, and should never have been included in the Bill in the first place. It is disingenuous of HS2 to say that it is no longer available. It was never available. I think it's an important point to make.

230. Slide A6362, the second slide, shows you how we have developed the land over the last couple of years, but indeed before that it was a piece of land that was owned by the School, is a key part of the footprint of the school and, in fact, even with this land, the School has been judged to not have sufficient outdoor play space for its children, so there was absolutely no way that it would have been feasible for that village hall to be replaced on that piece of land. I won't say any more about the village hall, because we're assured that it will be moved, and we would like to believe that.

231. Haul routes is another area where we have made significant representation, and again we welcome the assurance, if it can be delivered, that the haul routes will be moved from along Hob Lane. I've included two further slides. This first one shows what it's like on a typical day. This is, admittedly, at picking up time and dropping off

time in the mornings. But the row of cars at the top left, that row of cars outside the School remains that way all day, because there is not enough parking for staff. So there is always this blind bend and single track road. So this road would be entirely inappropriate. Can I just show you the next slide as well? Again, I've highlighted areas where traffic cannot pass easily, and it's not appropriate where you've got children walking on a narrow road with a pavement next to heavy goods vehicles. So I'm reassured that the proposal is there to move the haul route, but I'm also fully expecting that that new proposal will be petitioned against, and therefore I've included these slides to illustrate, for the Select Committee, just how important it is that this route is not used by heavy goods vehicles.

232. There is still some concern, but there's no clarity on the amount of traffic that workers coming into the HS2 construction sites would bring down Hob Lane, and again, just an increase in normal car traffic would have a significant impact in this lane. Lots of cars having to reverse down 30 metres of parked cars in order to let people go past. If traffic is increased there would be a big impact to the School community.

233. My third point, which isn't addressed by any other assurances, is about the severance of the School from the village community. It has been said that the severance is not going to happen because Cromwell Lane will be re-routed. But, in effect, the School will be severed from its community through roadworks and visual separation. While the cut and cover tunnel is constructed the surface disruption on Cromwell Lane will make daily commuting very difficult, the school run a nightmare, and it's not easy already, and the two to three years worth of roadworks and disruption would be unacceptable as part of this day to day commute.

234. As well as that, there would be families' perception of the safety of the route in walking and cycling their children to School from one side of the village, past the roadworks and construction site, through to the School, and we feel that families will choose elsewhere, because they will not want to run that gauntlet every day and put the safety of their children at risk in walking through a construction site, and equally that construction zone, for two to three years, will not be experienced as temporary. For that period of time, that's a significant roadworks, and it's not going to seem like a temporary diversion.

235. My fourth point is about construction noise and dust. There will be a loss of outdoor amenities in the area. The Greenway and footpaths around are the only outdoor space that families can use. Whilst we can look at fields, they're not ours to go into. So we actually don't have large areas of land that we can run around with parkland. The Greenway and footpaths are a really key part of that. And the psychological and physical wellbeing of children and their families is threatened while this is not taken into account.

236. We are concerned about the impact of sleep and wellbeing on children, for whom three years is a significant proportion of their childhood, and whilst there are timings for when construction would be occurring, very young children go to bed early, and that would have an impact if the noises are continuing into the evening. And the effects for families of living in a construction zone for several years cannot be underestimated. Families in the village are already under significant stress from the last five years of psychological stress because of HS2 proposal. Moving forward, when they're actually digging up the village, that is going to take its toll on our families and, because the families that live in the village are coming to the School and their children, who we are educating, this is going to have an impact.

237. My fifth point is about the noise impact of HS2 once operating, and really it's flagged as a concern. It may well be that we can be reassured on that concern. But currently we have no clear idea of the impact on residents of the actual noise, because most of the maps and diagrams from engineers have shown average noise, which doesn't show you how loud a train actually is when it wakes you up in the night, and averaging it out across the quiet times where there is no train is clearly nonsense. So what we're saying is that there is a change from a peaceful environment to an environment where a high speed train is bursting through, and what we don't understand is the shock impact of that increased noise, and what that actually feels like in reality, and how that might have psychological stress.

238. There are numerous studies by the World Health Organisation and others, and we detailed these, in quite a lot of detail, in our consultation responses over the years, about detrimental effects of environmental noise on children's learning abilities, on sleep disturbance impacts on their cognitive development, and on the psychological and physiological effects of noise on both children and adults and, whilst our School may be

physically sufficiently distant from the line to not have those effects, we hope, on a day to day basis, it's about where our children live and how they are experiencing their lives in the village.

239. We also note that this noise impact would be particularly keenly felt by Burton Green residents as many have explicitly chosen to live here for the peace and tranquillity in which to bring up their children, and that peace and tranquillity will no longer be an aspect of their lives.

240. The above concerns that I've outlined: The severance, the construction impacts and the environmental damage would, in our view, be significantly mitigated if a bore tunnel was used instead of cut and cover. This would resolve many of the direct and indirect impacts felt by the School, and would, indeed, support community sustainability, and we commend that proposal to you.

241. My final area is the area that probably gives the School the most significant concern, because it does affect our day to day financial viability. There is a significant financial impact on the School of HS2, and this is detailed in our petition. It's not covered by any of the petition responses from HS2. Taking the environmental, construction, and community impacts of HS2 altogether, the School is concerned that such a high level of community blight will, inevitably, result in a drop in pupil numbers as families leave the area, because HS2 are buying their houses, or because they decide that they don't want to drive through roadworks every day to get to a school. They will find schools that are unaffected by HS2 and that are easier to get to. Now, in the past, and currently, there is always a balance between families leaving an area because of job or employment prospects and relocations, and then other families coming in and filling those places, and we always hope that families that move in will have a child in the right year group to be able to fill the vacancies that we have, and we've always carried that balance as families come and go. What we're most concerned about is that this natural movement, that is currently balanced, will be imbalanced in future because of the blight of HS2.

242. Once construction is underway, we think that properties will be harder to rent to families within the village, and this will mean that we will maintain a drop in pupil numbers. The impact here is of particular concern, because small schools have very

high fixed costs. You have to put a teacher in front of a classroom. Even if you've only got ten pupils you have to give them a teacher, you can't give them a third of a teacher. They've got to be there all the time, and the funding of schools is largely based on pupil numbers. So every pupil counts, significantly, for us.

243. Each pupil brings in around £2,500 of income per year. So that's the price on their head of any pupil that is withdrawn from the School. Any reduction in pupil numbers has a significant and detrimental effect on the School's ability to fund core educational and welfare provision, and jeopardises the quality of the provision for the remaining children. I'd like to now ask our head teacher, Sue Patterson, to just detail the kind of decisions that a head teacher would have to make under those kind of financial constraints. It's one that we've had many experiences of in the past.

244. MRS PATTERSON: Hello, thank you for giving us this time to present the School case to you. I'm passionate about teaching. I love it. It's a vocation. It's not a job. I'm especially privileged to be the head of a small village school. That gives me the opportunity to bring together heart and head, and a village school is about much more than providing the highest quality of academic education that we can, but it's also about providing the children with the links with their community, that in the fullness of time will enable them to go out into the world to become active participants in their communities. You never know, maybe even an MP one day. But there are many joys and privileges...

245. MR MEARNS: You should raise their aspirations, actually.

246. MRS PATTERSON: There are many privileges of being the head of a village school, and one of them is the joint challenge of managing the school budget, and Thea has identified really where most of our money comes from. We get a lump sum, and then it's based on age related pupil units of about £2,500 each year. The government has put significant additional funding into education over the last few years. Most of that has been linked to a deprivation factor. Whilst we do have some children who benefit from some income from Pupil Premium funding, we have very few. So, as deprivation factor funding increases, we lose out on that. If we lose pupil numbers, then we also lose that income as well.

247. Over many years, governors have juggled decision-making, really, about how they can most effectively use financing. When we come to appoint staff, yes, we want to appoint the staff that are the most experienced, but we have to look at the financial balance and that's not a good way to appoint staff. That should be the last aspect that comes into something.

248. When I talk about bringing together heart and head in a village school, each of my members of staff on a daily basis has to think about that because no allowances are paid for additional responsibilities. In a larger school, a teacher may be expected to be operating one subject area as a leader. In our school, my staff have got two subjects to manage, maybe even three subjects to manage, so they definitely need to make the decision that actually their role is a vocation and not just a job.

249. For many years, the head teacher has had a teaching commitment. Our statistics show that as a result of that pressure, we have had eight heads in 14 years. Now, that is about managing finance and actually making a leadership role manageable. But it's not only the big decisions that the governors have tossed about over the years. It's day-to-day decisions that really make an impact in the classroom, and that's why our school is there. The most important people in our school building are the children and if we can't provide them with the best teaching and the best resources then we are letting them down. Things like we're developing our early years curriculum at the moment. I have to look very carefully through the catalogue to make sure that I get best value for money. That applies to maybe a cheaper quality of sand.

250. The new curriculum has come in. It's got lots and lots of advantages, but it also has lots of resources that need to be purchased. Each of those is a decision that has to be thought about very carefully. How long will the art brushes last? Can we really afford to provide Pritt Sticks in every classroom? Those are things that people take for granted, but they are things that we are already tossing about. One of my teachers last year asked her family for a Christmas present. 'Of course we're going to buy you a Christmas present', they said, 'We want to value you. You are a very precious member of our family. What would you like? Maybe a piece of jewellery; maybe a piece of clothing'. 'No', she replied. 'I'd like 48 Pritt Sticks'. And that was what she got. People are providing – staff are providing their own equipment on a daily basis, not because I ask them to, but that is a culture that is there in the school because if they are

going to do the best that they want to for each child in their class, they want to give them a little bit extra.

251. I've got a very fastidious governor who actually checks my budget sheets every month. I would not be able to live without here, but she's looking at how much does it cost for a dustbin to be emptied. If she can negotiate £1.50 off the cost of each lift then she celebrates. We're already operating a very, very tight ship and I hope that some of those examples give you an idea of the sort of decisions that are not major decisions, but they are the sorts of things that do impact with us on a daily basis.

252. There have been changes that have been made to the proposals that we appreciate and we think they are an improvement on the original proposal for us. But despite the changes to the scheme, there is going to be a bottleneck on Cromwell Lane. That is going to impact upon families bringing their children to school. I'm a grandma. I know I probably only look 21, but in fact I have got four grandchildren, and I suspect that some of the gentlemen around here have also got grandchildren. The question I ask myself is, if I lived on Cromwell Lane and my child was five years old, and I desperately wanted to take them to the excellent primary school just down the road but I'd got to walk through a bottleneck of construction traffic that maybe had got a slight diversion but was going to cause uncertainty in traffic, would I take my child by the hand and walk them to school along Cromwell Lane? If I thought about that carefully and truthfully, the answer is probably no.

253. If more than two or three grandparents or parents make that decision, then we are very quickly into a cycle of falling rolls. For each four children that we lose, we lose a teaching assistant. Once you start losing staffing, then you alter the organisation of the school. Very quickly you don't have two age groups in a classroom; you have three age groups in a classroom. You don't have four classes in a school; you have three classes in a school. When you show people round, not only have they got to go through a bottleneck on Cromwell Lane to get there, but they're also starting to ask questions about 'How effective is teaching and learning in a classroom with four age groups? Do I really want to send my child there?' It doesn't matter how high the quality of education is that we are providing; it's those doubts that are planted in people's minds that make the difference.

254. The school has done everything that it can to actually manage the financial challenges of being a small school, to such an extent that, in this last September, we became a federation. We're two schools working together. We are the Green Leek Federation and I am the head of two small schools. It shows that small schools really are worthwhile, but it does mean that we have taken every action that we possibly can ourselves to save our school. It would be absolutely dreadful if something like the disruption on Cromwell Lane affecting our roll would take away all of the progress that we have made, so this is a significant difficulty for us. We do need some assurances that the funding of the school will continue to make us sustainable. Thank you.

255. MS GIBBS: Thank you, Sue, for describing the situation. I'll underline that any pupil number drop would steadily erode the school's financial viability. If it were forced to close, this would be a permanent adverse effect on the village. Even while the construction might be seen as temporary, the closure of the school would be permanent.

256. We would like to talk about financial mitigation, because we believe that the scale of the blight on Burton Green by HS2 puts the school's financial sustainability at risk, and that the closure of the school would be an unacceptable consequence of HS2, which is supposed to be in the national interest. If the national interest is to be served, then the risk to the school should be mitigated by an undertaking that any financial losses suffered by the school as a direct result of HS2 would be made good.

257. The funding gap, if we experience a funding gap because pupils have moved out of the area or their families choose not to send them to school, should be covered until either the vacancy of the pupil moves out of the school cycle or until HS2 construction is complete or until, indeed, a new family comes into the village and we're able to fill that vacancy. Whilst the vacancy is left unfilled, when it can be shown that it's a direct result of HS2 happening, then we do believe that the funding gap should be covered.

258. We are talking about extremely small sums in the scale of this project but, in the case of this school and where it affects our potential to continue, this is significant. We are not asking for changes in the school's funding formula arrangements. That clearly is beyond this Committee, but what we are requesting is that, where financial losses are experienced as a direct result of the construction of HS2, they should be remedied. HS2

is likely to cause financial hardship to the school and, under the polluter pays principle, it should be responsible for rectifying this situation. This temporary hardship would have a permanent impact.

259. The sums involved are likely to be extremely small, given the scale of the project. We're looking at tens of thousands at most but, in a small school, as Sue has described, every penny counts and every penny is felt. Either addition or subtraction of those pennies makes every difference to day-to-day life. The school would not be financially advantaged through an arrangement whereby the funding gap was covered; it would merely allow it to maintain its current provision and to maintain the educational provision that it provides. We're not looking to benefit financially; we're just looking to maintaining the current status that we would have should HS2 not go ahead.

260. The demand for primary places, we are told, is actually increasing in the Kenilworth area. If that's the case and there is more demand from people coming to our village school, then this underwriting or guarantee would cost nothing, if that's the case. If, even though there is more demand on primary school places and we still experience a drop in our numbers, then we will know for sure that HS2 has been the result of that. It would highlight the problem even more so.

261. We have raised this issue with HS2, through our MP and through our county councillor, on a number of occasions over the last two years, to no avail. HS2 claims not to have the authority to address the issue and also has stated that our fears are unfounded and that the construction impacts are likely to be minimal and, therefore, we will maintain our pupil numbers. As you can imagine, I beg to differ. However, to leave the school's likely financial losses unmitigated is to gamble with our children's education and with one of our community's most valuable assets. I believe this is unacceptable. I therefore humbly ask that the Committee gives due consideration to our request for financial mitigation. If HS2 is right, and I would be glad if they are, then the cost of providing this undertaking is negligible. If they are wrong and nothing is put in place, the political and community costs of the school closing would be disastrous.

262. In summary, we are requesting a financial guarantee to assure the long-term future of our school and our community. We are requesting that consideration is given to the

length of time of the construction works from a child's perspective. Two or three years is a significant part of a child's life in the village, as they are growing up, and a board tunnel would obviously reduce this impact on the community's sustainability.

263. Lastly, I request that the temporary construction period is seen in terms of the likely permanent impact that could happen, including the closure of the school and, therefore, more consideration is given to the permanent adverse impacts of HS2 than seeing it as a temporary occurrence. In fact, we believe there would be significant permanent adverse effects on our village and on the school in particular. Thank you for hearing us.

264. CHAIR: Thank you very much. Mr Strachan.

265. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Thank you. Can I just start by emphasising that the effects on Burton Green Primary School, in terms of the construction of the HS2 scheme, have been considered in some detail? The points that were raised of concern have in fact been addressed. I just want to explain what has been done. The first point was a concern about construction traffic using Hob Lane.

266. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: The first concern that you bring in is actually whether the school remains viable and whether it had enough pupils to keep going.

267. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I was dealing with it in the order that they were raised.

268. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: I see.

269. MS GIBBS: It is a primary concern that hasn't been addressed.

270. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): When I said 'first', I was dealing with it in the sequence in which they were dealt that, but I take that as the last. I can deal with them in any order, but I'll stick with the order I've got to begin with. The first concern was about Hob Lane and construction traffic, and that has been addressed through the proposals that have been suggested by the promoter under the AP2 provision. The

effect of that is that Hob Lane is not proposed for construction traffic at all. I've shown you that on the plans; I don't need to get them back up. The photographs you've seen about the concern of Hob Lane used for construction vehicles is one that has been addressed.

271. I think there was a concern associated with that about workers' vehicles. That is covered in considerable detail in the code of construction practice about travel plans for workers. Again, it's not anticipated that there would be much flow along Hob Lane, but it's precisely the sort of thing that's regulated as a travel plan.

272. Coming to the second concern, which does tie into the primary concerns, as I've understood them, that is a concern about the bottleneck on Cromwell Lane having an effect on the numbers of pupils wanting to attend or being willing to attend, and the perception of the school by people who might use it. There is an important point – it's a misconception, I'm afraid – as to what's going to happen at Cromwell Lane. It's important that I clarify it.

273. Cromwell Lane is currently a single lane as it crosses the Kenilworth Greenway. Under the proposed scheme for construction, a two-way lane temporary diversion is put in place, as I've already indicated. During the construction period, and I can show you this on P2171, during the construction period a two-lane temporary diversion is created at the point of Cromwell Lane, where it crosses the scheme. Contrary to – and I understand there may be an impression that there would be a bottleneck there or there's going to be a perception that it's a building site or a problem in that respect – that is not what is proposed under the construction of the scheme. To the contrary, a two-lane temporary diversion is put in place. The only period of disruption would occur during the overnight tie-ins. That two-lane is constructed offline and then it's tied in to ensure that there is no disruption, no material disruption, to the residents of Burton Green and anyone accessing the school towards Hob Lane. That's important, because it appears there may be a misconception about that.

274. That is the position whilst construction is occurring. It is not crossing over a building site or anything of that kind. It's not a bottleneck. It's actually intended to be a diversion that ensures free flow. That's not just a benefit to Burton Green; it is directly

relevant to the concern raised by the school.

275. In the operational phase of the scheme, i.e. what it's finished, that two-way crossing the Kenilworth Greenway on Cromwell Lane goes back online, but it's a two-way crossing. It will actually be, in that respect, less of a bottleneck than it is currently, if it's perceived to be one. It's currently single-way. Under this scheme, it becomes two-way. The scheme as it is does potentially improve the road infrastructure there. That is an important perhaps misconception, but I just wanted to clarify.

276. There is no material effect from noise on the school itself. I can show you the plans. I think that was probably accepted in terms of what's been shown.

277. The concern of the last point, or the primary concern, is the effect on the funding of the school if pupil numbers drop. There are two key points in this. The first is that the scheme is designed to avoid the very effects that the school is expressing as concerns as to why the numbers might drop. The principal answer to this is we do not anticipate the very effects, because they are designed out, that are of concern to the school, i.e. access problems or perception problems of getting to the school, or issues of that kind. Those are ones that are designed out of the school.

278. MR MEARNNS: How many dwellings have been acquired, Mr Strachan?

279. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): There are three buildings that are required to be demolished – three dwellings and the village hall. There are a number of dwellings that are within the safeguarding, so people can serve statutory blight notices or apply under the exceptional hardship schemes or need-to-sell schemes. To date, as I understand it, 15 properties have been acquired by HS2. Other than the three that are demolished those are not to be demolished. To the contrary, HS2 re-lets them so people can move if they want, but the idea is that people will move into them.

280. As I understand it, to date, 15 properties have been acquired by HS2. Eight of those are already re-let. Another one is under offer. Two are advertised. One is unlettable. I suspect that's one of the properties to be demolished. Three are vacant or undergoing work. When we acquire them, sometimes work is done to them to make

them lettable.

281. MR THORNTON: Just following on from that, Ms Patterson, do you know, of the houses that have been let, have changed ownership or whatever, have you lost pupils because of that?

282. MRS PATTERSON: We have lost pupils who have moved out of houses, who have relocated, because they've moved because of HS2. We have taken in two pupils who were on a temporary let. One house has had pupils come into it on a temporary let.

283. MR THORNTON: What's the net loss?

284. MS GIBBS: It's balanced currently but, with the construction work, I suspect that the houses will be more difficult to rent out. For those that are being rented, because they are then more transient communities that move when they wish to do so, they may well move because they can, so the nature of the community is changed. In fact, the house that has been re-let to a family, where two new pupils have come to a house, is the one house that is due to be demolished, so those children will in fact be leaving the school because, in two years' time, their house is due to be demolished.

285. MRS PATTERSON: The children who we've taken in this year, who have kept the balance, have actually come into Key Stage 2. The key point that we need to monitor very carefully is admissions into school in reception. If our numbers drop there, then that would be the place where it would be very difficult to add to them.

286. CHAIR: You hadn't finished, had you, Mr Strachan?

287. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): No, I hadn't. There are two points. The first is, so far as the promoter is concerned, as I explained, every effort is made to ensure that the concerns that might lead people to perceive the school as less attractive or not a place to have their children educated are, in reality, minimised, reduced or eliminated completely. That is what the scheme can do, just as any other scheme that is constructed in an area can minimise its impact on it.

288. The second point is a wider issue of principle about funding by local education authorities of schools. I understand the concern is that, if numbers were to drop, which is, from our perspective, not what is anticipated, but if numbers were to drop then the local education authority has its own funding mechanisms based on numbers of pupils on roll, as to how much money they give the school. As I said, we can address the first by ensuring our scheme doesn't have a material impact on the school. As to the way –

289. MR MEARNNS: You're getting into dodgy ground, Mr Strachan. I know quite a lot about this. There is an age-rated pupil unit. Well, it used to be called an age-rated pupil unit, which is generated depending on the age of the child within the school. In terms of the local authority using its discretion to top up schools, it's quite a long time since I've heard that being done. Quite a number of years ago, schools used to be funded on the number of places, rather than the number of pupils, but that's an awful long time ago.

290. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes, but the point I'm making is that the way in which local education authorities fund primary school provision or any school provision is a matter, ultimately, for them and central government.

291. MR MEARNNS: They've got a formula that you're sticking with.

292. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): If there is an issue, which I don't understand there to be, but if there is an issue as to the way in which the funding mechanism works that is predominantly a matter for local education authorities and central government to resolve. It isn't a matter that's within the remit of this scheme and it's an issue that could arise generally for any other project that's perceived to have an indirect effect on the attractiveness of a school.

293. MR MEARNNS: The problem from the perspective of the petitioners is that, in a small school scenario, where you don't have the large-school economies of scale, a marginal reduction of funding, through the loss of a single pupil, can actually mean the loss of a whole teacher; because, if you haven't got enough to fund 20,000 because you're 2,000 short, you've got to lose the 20,000.

294. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I come back to my two main answers. The first is that, from the scheme's perspective, what can be done is to ensure the minimum effect in the way that's been done, so that those sorts of problems don't occur. If they do occur, however, and there is what's called a funding gap and it affects smaller schools disproportionately in the way that's been suggested, that is a matter for local education authorities to pursue with central government, if there is a problem of that kind. I don't profess to be an expert on issues of funding but, if there is an issue for smaller schools in the way they receive funding at those sorts of level, that is not a matter within the remit of this scheme. That's a matter for local education authorities and central government to resolve.

295. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Can I test this a bit? I'm reminded by looking at Thea Gibbs of The Theory of Everything, because Felicity looks a bit like you, but it's not the theory; it's the practice. If the promoters are right in saying that the number of children coming up to reception class and going through the primary school will remain the same or increase, then there's no problem. If that's generally the case, but there's a problem for a year or two, there can be a problem.

296. I'm going to step back a bit. Am I right in saying this is about the only community where the railway drives straight through the middle?

297. FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY: Yes.

298. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: You're not supposed to say anything. Let's assume it's rare for the railway to go straight through a community in this sort of way. I will assume that, even if you can't.

299. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Can I just put in context? What is done in terms of the railway is a cut-and-cover tunnel.

300. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Forgive me, but we've heard that. We won't let petitioners repeat themselves. I don't see why...

301. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): All I'm drawing attention to is, in fact, what the

scheme requires of properties is three dwellings.

302. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Credit us with having listened. What I'm trying to say to you is I think we have a special case here. I can't think of anything else we've heard so far that has similar possible implications of having a primary school where the promoters have done quite a lot to relieve some of the practical problems of actually getting to the school, of having HGVs going down past the school. That's welcome, and various other changes have been made, which are good, like the village hall not coming on to school land and other things, which everyone, I think, appreciates and are sensible.

303. The issue comes where there's any problem at all for the school numbers for the school to remain viable each year overall and after the scheme is completed. We can assume that, after the scheme is completed, homes will be occupied in a normal sort of way, so we're actually talking about a problem between now and the scheme probably starting and during the time of the construction of the scheme, which takes us two years or three years to the start of the scheme and, say, five years of effective construction. That's a seven-year period.

304. If we're dealing with the question of being short of a number of pupils in reception or going through, which is the time that a child will spend in a primary school, what kind of potential cost would it be to the promoters to make an arrangement, either with the education authority or with the school itself, to say that, if a temporary top-up is needed to maintain the staffing of the school so it remains viable, what sorts of figures might potentially be involved, always assuming – not assuming, but remembering – that the promoters believe that it won't have this effect, so it won't cost anything? What we're really saying to you – don't try to answer now – is that's defining the issue in the short term and the medium term. We'd like you to give some consideration to how that can be approached.

305. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I can't answer your question no, because it's beyond my knowledge as to what sort of cost implications that would entail.

306. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Can we leave that request with you?

307. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I understand the question.
308. MR THORNTON: If you're right, there won't be any cost implications.
309. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): If I'm right then, of course, in terms of the impact –
310. MR THORNTON: If you're wrong, you'll want to help, won't you?
311. MR MEARNNS: Can I ask a further technical question? Is there a differential between a Key Stage 1 pupil unit and a Key Stage 2 pupil unit?
312. MS GIBBS: No, they're primary units.
313. MR MEARNNS: It's just a primary unit. That's fine.
314. MRS PATTERSON: I've just done a quick calculation here. Assuming that we didn't take in two children in reception, the cost would be £5,000. In the second year, it would be £5,000 for those two children plus £5,000, so it's actually a pattern. Over a five-year period, the total cost would be £105,000.
315. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): As I say, I can take it away and find out what the issue is. I have understood the question and I'll find out.
316. CHAIR: Okay, good. Final comments?
317. MS GIBBS: Can I ask another couple of follow-up questions, if I may? The diversion of Cromwell Lane that you've talked about, could you tell me how many footpaths are on that diversion? At the moment, we have a footpath on each side.
318. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Two.
319. MS GIBBS: Is there any proposal to assist in the mornings, such as lollipop crossings or anything like that or is your view that that's unnecessary?

320. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I'll check. I understand that the details of construction effects are covered by the code of construction practice under which, as part of any traffic routing or the overall traffic routing of construction traffic around the area, the details will be looked at. Those include, as we've discussed before, avoiding school times where there is construction traffic passing through. We've largely eliminated that. If there is perceived to be a need for lollipop ladies or anything of that kind that would be the sort of detail I expect to be dealt with as a part of the detailed design of the code of construction practice. From what I've already addressed, the reason why I haven't raised this explicitly is because there isn't intended to be any effect that would cause there to be a need for lollipop ladies, but I'm not precluding it if that's emerged through detailed design in the code of construction practice.

321. MS GIBBS: I'd like to just emphasise a couple of points again that I think have been lost, in that it is about the perception of the community. It goes beyond this road. It's the totality of the impact on the whole village that makes the school potentially less desirable to families coming in. We're not just talking about that access; we're talking about what it feels like to live in this community that is blighted to this degree.

322. I would also say it is our experience, over a number of years of a lot of negotiating with our local authority in terms of education funding that there is no such funding available to cover our funding gap. It is not the local authority that is building HS2. It is not their responsibility to cover that funding gap.

323. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I can just deal with the perception point. I recognise that there's maybe a perception, but I'm trying to make sure that the correct facts are put before the Committee and, indeed, the school. It should be clear, if it isn't now, that if there is a perception that there's going to be a blockage point or some restrictions in traffic flow that isn't the case for the reasons I've been through.

324. MR MEARNS: Can I also wonder about you said you've done some maths, in terms of how you believe the impact is going to happen to the school, in terms of overall numbers? You've done a balancing act. The DfE used to do a sort of basic statistic, in terms of how many pupils would be generated by development of 100 properties. It was

six pupils per year group per 100 properties. The thing is those numbers vary depending on the number of, say, one-bedroom flats as opposed to two- and three-bedroom houses. If you have more two- and three-bedroom houses, those numbers would go up above six, depending on the type of property. I'm just wondering if that's been built into the thinking, in terms of the loss of 15 properties on a temporary basis, within the locality.

325. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I'm taking away the calculation. I understand the point. I think the point would probably work the other way, in terms of future development in this area, like any other area, is actually normally likely to lead to the increased pressure on schools. That's what's normally felt.

326. MR MEARNS: Except that we've already heard that the area is surrounded by greenbelt.

327. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): It can be in the Coventry area above. Generally, there will be allocations for housing and normally one is looking at increased pressure on primary schools, which is where those funding calculations come from, the idea being to pay money to provide extra school provision. I'll take that point away as part of the calculations, but I'm just anticipating that it's more likely to lead to showing an increase in demand – I don't know, but I'll find out – on this school, than taking away demand.

328. MRS PATTERSON: If you manage to build this magnificent tunnel and railway line without any disruption on Cromwell Lane, I congratulate you, because it looks to me like a huge undertaking to have something that doesn't cause any disruption on a vital point between the village and the school. What I would just say is that my perception is, and it might be wrong, that there will be disruption. I know that you say that, in reality, you don't feel that there will be, but people choose schools on their perception of what they think is going to happen. Once they've chosen a school on that perception, whether the reality actually matches their perception or not, the impact on the school is still that they have made that decision based on their perception.

329. CHAIR: Can you write to me, setting out budget, pupils, the impact of losing people on reception and what impact it has through the school, and copy it to HS2?

330. MRS PATTERSON: Okay, thank you.

331. CHAIR: Then there are some figures to argue about and we know what we're talking about. I think that would be the easiest thing to do.

332. MRS PATTERSON: Thank you very much.

333. CHAIR: Thank you very much. Safe journey back. Right, now we move on the Greenway Trust. We're going to have a five-minute comfort break and then we'll move on to the Greenway Trust. Order, order.

*Sitting suspended*

*On resuming—*

### **The Greenway Trust**

334. CHAIR: Welcome back, everybody. We now go on to the Greenway Trust. We hope to stop at one. You seem quite confident you can make your case in 30 minutes. We hope you can, and then we'll be back at two, probably for HS2's response and then for the other petitioners, the residents and Mr Langdon. Do you want to kick off, Mr Whitehouse?

335. MR WHITEHOUSE: Thank you very much, Chair. Thank you to the members of the Committee for this opportunity. My name is John Whitehouse; I'm the county councillor for Kenilworth Abbey. That's an area that covers the northern third of Kenilworth, together with the village of Burton Green, and the Warwickshire part of the University of Warwick campus. That's just the geographical area it covers. I'm a steering group member of the Greenway Trust, not the Chair, as was mentioned yesterday. Sitting to my right, Nick Hillard is the Chair of the Greenway Trust and will be talking later.

336. If we go on to the next slide, the Greenway is referred to specifically in at least 47

separate petitions in front of this Committee, from a variety of areas, organisations and individuals. This clearly does reflect the importance of the Greenway in the lives of so many local people. In terms of Burton Green in particular, the other petitioners have agreed that we should take the lead today in terms of the Greenway and its issues. Next slide, please.

337. What is the Greenway Trust? Community involvement with Warwickshire, in terms of the development and promotion of these routes, goes back to 1996 when the first interest group was formed, later known as the Friends of the Kenilworth Greenway. The Greenway Trust itself, in its current form, was formed as a charitable organisation in 2012, towards the end of Connect to Kenilworth project, which I'll talk about in a moment. Our role, in terms of the ongoing management of the Greenway, is set out in some detail in the management plan, which Warwickshire County Council has established for the Kenilworth Greenway. Next slide, please.

338. Now, I mentioned the Greenway Trust was formed during the completion of the Connect to Kenilworth project. 'Connect to', which I'm sure you may have heard of during its time, was a national Sustrans scheme, which won £50 million of Big Lottery prize money in December 2007. Kenilworth was one of 79 schemes funded with local match funding from Warwickshire County Council. Although parts of what we now know as the Greenway had been partially open for public recreational use since the 1960s, when the previous railway line was closed, it was the Connect to Kenilworth project that transformed it into the wonderful all-weather facility we have today.

339. The total cost of the project was about £1.5 million, shared between Warwickshire County Council, Sustrans and the University of Warwick. I had the great honour of chairing the multi-organisation steering group, which was set up to oversee the local project and which met bi-monthly for five years. The members of the steering group are listed on the slide. We involved a wide range of local stakeholders and I believe we achieved real engagement of the local community in the detailed design and decisions about the scheme. Next slide, please.

340. Those of you who came on the site visit may recall the little handout that I have you on the day. This is the outside cover, and it's just a reminder really of where this

scheme sits with the partners shown on the back there, Sustrans, the Lottery funding and so on.

341. If we go to the next slide, this was the foldout map. I think it's quite useful in terms of two or three things. Firstly, I've highlighted on there the various points along the route that you've visited during your two site visits to this area – so on 16 September, down at the Berkswell Station end and then, on 7 October, your very brief stop at Waste Lane, the longer stop walking down the ramp from Cromwell Lane and then the last stop, when you got off and looked at the green bridge and went to look at the Y-junction between the two paths.

342. The other thing you can see from this slide, I think, is how the route carries on into Kenilworth itself and indeed goes right through to the town centre, right next to the historic Abbey Fields. That was one of the big things that the Connect to Kenilworth project did: it was to actually create this facility and link it right into the town centre. The green bridge, which you stood on, was a vital part of making that a seamless link. Next slide, please.

343. This chart I showed when you had the site visit. I won't linger on it too much now, but this was from an automatic recorder which is still there on the Greenway, just near that Y-junction. It shows the weekly usage of the Greenway, split between direction and split between type of user. In this case, it's splitting between pedestrians and cyclists. The things to draw from this are, firstly, in some of the peak weeks we're achieving usage of something like 5,000 users a week. Even in the very darkest winter months, we never drop below 2,000 a week. A visit to the Greenway any day of the week, any day of the year, will demonstrate to you how many people are there.

344. CHAIR: We've heard also some people commute down the line.

345. MR WHITEHOUSE: Indeed they do, Chair, and I shall come on to that. Next slide, please. This slide was also shown on the site visit. This was from a survey of Greenway users that we undertook, and it demonstrates where users come from. Clearly the largest quadrants are from Kenilworth and Burton Green. There's a significant quadrant from the Berkswell and Balsall Common communities, from Coventry itself

and farther afield, so a very wide spread of users come and use it.

346. In terms of how they use it, 65% of people use it at least a week. They're there once a week. 21% use it almost every day. It's a really key part of many people's lives. Next slide, please.

347. This collage of photos shows some of the many different uses of the Greenway throughout the year. It's referred to often as a linear country park. I think that is the right description, somewhere that people go not just to get from A to B, but for healthy exercise, peace and quiet, and the opportunity to interact with the lovely countryside through which the Greenway passes. Next slide, please.

348. This is our version of the slide you saw earlier, where we think we stand today in terms of our petition issues. We've grouped and summarised our main petition paragraphs there. We've highlighted the ones that are not resolved as far as we're concerned and, in terms of the pending ones, those are mostly as a result of waiting perhaps for the more detailed discussions that follow around AP2, for example. We do think, as we stand, that we have a lot of unresolved issues today. I won't be going through every item, but I'm going to go on to the key ones.

349. On the next slide, we've tried to summarise – which I think is the sort of thing you want to see – what our key asks are. I won't read them out; the words are there on the slide. These are our key asks and we hope we've demonstrated how important the Greenway is to the local area. We've received many testimonials from Greenway users as to its importance in terms of their health and wellbeing, and their love of the natural environment, which it allows them to access. Some of these are reflected in the statements about the Greenway by individual petitioners, which you've seen.

350. Our big worry and it has been all along, is that HS2 still don't really get it as far as the Greenway and Connect to Kenilworth are concerned. In all of the original documentation about HS2, there was no mention whatsoever – I won't go on about disused railway lines; that was covered yesterday – of public rights of way. Gradually, by the time we got to the draft environmental statement, the words 'Greenway' and 'Connect to Kenilworth' were starting to come into the vocabulary, but they were still

being used rather inconsistently. It's only really as we started to get to the environmental statement that the Greenway was starting to take a central place in the HS2 thinking that I think is there today.

351. HS2 has come some way since then, but it's taken us nearly five years to get here and we think there's a long way to go yet. For example, one of the phrases used in the promoter's response document that we received as that, in relation to the Greenway, 'The intention is that any new, realigned or diverted routes should retain similar characteristics to other local public rights of way.' Now, we've tried to explain why the Greenway is a special case, we believe, so we don't think that this assurance is anywhere near good enough. It isn't just another local public right of way.

352. The next slide may help to explain why. This is Mr Robin Billington from the Kenilworth Disability Association. He was a member of the Connect to Kenilworth steering group throughout the design and construction of the scheme. He's given me full permission to use his photo and statements today. His contribution was vital to the efforts we put in to make sure that the routes were as accessible to all types of user as we could possibly make them. For example, the cattle grid in the photo, which is just at the bottom –

353. MR BELLINGHAM: Did we visit that particular spot, Councillor, when we were on the site visit?

354. MR WHITEHOUSE: You look down on it, Mr Bellingham, yes. You were up on the Greenway and, if you looked just down, this was the first of the cattle grids as the little path goes over the fields.

355. MR BELLINGHAM: Yes, I remember. I do remember looking down, yes.

356. MR WHITEHOUSE: Okay, so we modified this grid twice.

357. MR BELLINGHAM: Sorry to interrupt: is this the bit of the Greenway that goes to the University?

358. MR WHITEHOUSE: Yes, this is the start of the Greenway link to the University. We had to modify this grid twice before we got it right. There was a very delicate balance between getting it right for the farmer, so that his cattle's hooves didn't disappear down the cracks, getting it right for the wheelchair user, so that the level of vibration that the wheelchair user would experience as they were going over would be minimised. That was the attention to detail that was put in to making certain that this really accessible to all. In very simple terms, we took the approach generally that, if we got it right for Robin, we've probably got it right for most other people. It was a good litmus test for us.

359. Now, in Robin's statements there, he raises an important point about the impact of the 2010 Equalities Act. In the environmental statement, HS2 Limited admitted, in terms of the temporary diversions of both the Greenway and Connect to Kenilworth routes, that these could disadvantage some users more than others. Mr Billington questions the legality of such an approach under the terms of the Act. I've not easily found references to the Equalities Act anywhere in the environmental statement, and I would be interested in the response a bit later on that. Can I have the next slide, please?

360. Right, so these are views then taken along the route, the Connect to Kenilworth route, as it's become known, linking the Greenway to the University. We put a lot of money and time and effort into this path to make it accessible to all and, yes, although we thought originally that it was primarily going to be for cycle commuting between the University, the town of Kenilworth and the other communities served, we've actually found it immensely popular for leisure users as well. We get walkers, cyclists, wheelchair users and so on. They use it as a way of linking to the University, to the facilities at the University. The University coffee shop has done very well out of us, we think. They use it as a means of crossing what is a beautiful piece of countryside.

361. In the summer, the fields are full of maize. In the winter, they're grazed by cattle, but the cattle have not proved to be a deterrent to the users, as the usage numbers indicate. We have a group of dedicated volunteers who go out regularly and clear the cowpats, so it is an all-weather route and it's used extensively all year round. Next slide, please.

362. This was from a usage survey we did, sitting there at the Y-junction, to actually show the sort of routes that people were taking. You'll see that over 40% of the journeys going through the Y-junction were either to or from the University route, so it's a very popular part of the total scheme. Now unfortunately, as we all know, the route that we're currently on today over the fields goes exactly through the area that is impacted by the Canley Brook diversion. There is no way that the current route can survive and, therefore, the constructors, the promoters, need this route closed throughout the construction period. The question is: what do you do about that in the intervening time. Can I have the next slide, please?

363. What's set out in the environmental statement was for a planned temporary diversion of the route taking traffic coming from the Kenilworth direction farther along the Greenway from the current Y-junction to a point where an existing bridleway crosses over the top of the Greenway, and then over a new temporary path to a new bridge over the line of HS2. Now, it was admitted in the environmental statement that this was a pretty poor alternative and the statement was that the route would effectively be partially closed and unusable for its intended purpose, for a period that we believe is over five years. I've illustrated with some of the pictures some of the practical obstacles here.

364. If we go to the next slide, this is just a close-up of one of them. This is where the bridleway is about to go into the field and this was on a reasonably good day in early autumn. This bridleway track is used every day by the farmer, linking his farm with the fields. There is nothing currently in the environmental statement original hybrid bill proposals that does anything other than route traffic this way. There are no specific enhancements shown, no way of getting easily off the Greenway up to this bridleway, even if it was acceptable, that would do anything other than close this route, we believe, for the period of the construction. Next slide, please.

365. There are clear asks and always have been for a permanent high-quality diversion route to be built before the current Connect to Kenilworth route is closed. What the slide shows is the alternative proposal that was put forward jointly, some while ago, by the Greenway Trust and the University of Warwick. I have their permission to use this slide, which has been shared with HS2 Limited quite extensively during discussions that

they've had.

366. The problem we've had from the Greenway Trust, Chair, to be frank, is that we've not been involved in those discussions. There have been discussions with Warwickshire County Council about this route. There have been discussions with the University of Warwick. So far, other than the one formal meeting that we've had with HS2 Limited prior to this hearing, we've not got engaged and this is a source of some frustration for us, because we feel we have a view and we'd like to put it forward.

367. Our understanding, however, is that in the last meeting that HS2 Limited had with the University, HS2 Limited was suggesting that they really didn't like this alternative, this alternative being effectively to turn the temporary route into the permanent route and build it to the current and wide spec upfront. They didn't like that for a number of reasons and they were going to put forward an alternative, therefore, for consideration. Now, that alternative was made reference to when we met HS2 on 3 December. It was sort of in the pipeline then. I checked as recently as yesterday with Mr Fordham and it's still outstanding at the moment. At this moment in time, we don't have an alternative from HS2 Limited to what is on the table from the Greenway Trust and the University of Warwick.

368. We think the solution would work. It could be built upfront. If it was done to the right specification, it could enable the route to stay open throughout the construction period. We're obviously very willing and open to hear what the HS2 alternative is, but we haven't seen it yet.

369. Could I now turn to the temporary diversion in Burton Green? I apologise that the map that I've referred to here precedes AP2, but it doesn't really divert from the key points I tried to make here, because what is proposed is that, during the period of construction, the Greenway should be diverted off its current route, should be diverted up to Red Lane, should cross Red Lane and then mingle with the ordinary traffic up until the point where it reaches Hob Lane, and then cross Hob Lane before it then goes on a new route, a new temporary route, over the fields.

370. Now, the removal of the construction site that was previously planned there

clearly helps slightly here, but it doesn't take the problem away, because Red Lane itself is a pretty unpleasant and unsafe environment, we would put forward, for the type of people who use the Greenway, unless some provision is made to get them off-road. At the moment, it consists of a fairly narrow two-way country road, with a very narrow single footway on one side. If I could, just go to the next slide.

371. This chart shows the results of a routine traffic survey that was carried out by Warwickshire County Council in October 2012. What it highlights is the sort of average 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds that this road, at this location, typically experiences. This is quite fast-moving rat-run traffic in many parts of the day, and we're talking for Greenway users as we've seen, in terms of walkers, cyclists, pushchairs, wheelchair users, horses and so on. We don't think it's a safe environment for them, so our very clear ask is for a separate shared-use path and bridleway along this section between the two crossing points.

372. Within the promoter's response document, it has stated that the issue of the crossing points and how that needs to be handled will be dealt with by the code of construction practice. We believe those will actually require light-controlled crossings there and that is our ask. Can I have the next slide, please?

373. North of Burton Green, our basic ask is for the temporary diversion of the Greenway to be as physically separated from the construction work as possible, for effective visual and noise screening and for the route to be as non-circuitous as possible. The chart I've put there is an amalgam of two of the HS2 charts that I'm sure you've seen a number of times, covering the two geographical areas, because we wanted to highlight how, while the diversion route that is now proposed under AP1 is certainly an improvement for us, and does move the route farther away from the line of the working, over that section, the route itself remains fairly circuitous.

374. There are sections of the route, particularly towards the Berkswell end, where there have been no changes yet made about which we have ongoing concerns. You'll see that it runs immediately alongside areas of construction which, while we understand they're material stockpiling areas in the main, we're waiting yet for the detail as to what that will mean in practice. We'd much prefer, if a way could be found, to move that

route farther away. Very specifically in the middle of the chart, where the temporary route crosses Waste Lane, we've still got concerns about the detail of that, as to what that's going to look like in practice.

375. I think our message for the promoters on this whole section is: thank you for what you've done so far, but we do think more could be done. We'd very much like to work with you to actually see how we can make this section, over the period of construction, as least disruptive for Greenway users as we can make it. Next slide, please.

376. A very busy chart there, I'm sure, and I'm not going to read them all out, but we're now talking about the impact of HS2 on the Greenway in terms of the local environment and the safety, health and wellbeing of its users. My colleague Nick will talk further about this shortly. What I just wanted to highlight was these were the results of what our users have told us they've seen on the Greenway. These are sightings by members of the public of what they've seen, as they've gone along and used the Greenway. Now, we're not claiming that any, or indeed all, of these are rare and unique. No doubt if you were a determined rambler on some of the local footpaths around the area you would spot all of these. The point about this is these were spotted by local people on a path that is accessible to all, and those sightings that people made, often outside their normal experience, are pretty important to them to the extent that they felt the need to tell us about it and contribute to the sum of knowledge we've got. Next slide, please.

377. Now, we do have a particular concern about one aspect of noise impact on animals and that is the noise impact on horses using the Greenway, because this is a permissive bridleway over virtually its whole length. Although we've seen and read what is in the environmental statement, and this is Annex F of Appendix 3001000, I think it would be fair to admit that it's a fairly thin piece of work. It runs to four and a bit pages. I've quoted a couple of the phrases from the Appendix there and I think the summary is that, really, we don't know. We don't know what impact a high-speed train passing at speed in a confined environment might have on a horse that is maybe normally well controlled, in what is a very closed environment with a lot of vulnerable users nearby.

378. Given that situation and given the lack of evidence, our very clear ask is that the

precautionary principle is applied here. We don't feel that the current statement in the document that they should use this 100dBA threshold is good enough. It's based on draft standards produced in America. There's no real evidence to support it and, in the absence of that evidence, we'd like a much lower threshold used in terms of all the mitigation work done along the Greenway. A lot of the stuff that we talked about, about noise and impact on households and impact on people's gardens, we're in a different situation here. We don't feel that, so far, it's been well covered.

379. Right, in terms of what people love most about the Greenway and its peace and tranquillity, the views of the Arden landscape, after HS2, it can never be the same again. All the mitigation options on the table, the landscaping, the bunds and the noise barriers, the tree planting schemes, will not restore what we've lost. The only thing that would restore or would preserve the majority of what we're trying so desperately to preserve here would be one of the long deep-wall tunnel options. We've always supported Option F; that's the one that we would very much urge yourselves to consider, because it would remove many, if not all, of the most critical impacts on the Greenway itself. I've got one more slide.

380. Much has been said about the tunnel report and the sift analysis that underpins it. I know my colleague will talk this afternoon about it, but there were just two things that I'd like to highlight that I don't think have been said before. Firstly, in my response to the ES consultation, I raised the question as to why, in the top part, the actual assessment of the weightings is unbalanced. Something that is a minor worsening against the comparator scheme is given a double weighting compared with a minor improvement and nobody's ever explained that to me. Perhaps we'll get that explanation today.

381. The other thing is that all of the issues that we talk about, insofar as the Greenway Trust is concerned, are condensed into those 31 environmental factors which, when it comes to the route appraisal work, they just count as one. They're offset against all of the operational factors that have been brought into bear by the promoter, in terms of saying whether or not something's feasible or not. We have major concerns about that process as a result.

382. The last slide, back to the summary of our asks, previously I stated, Chair, that we would add to the front. We would ask that the deep-wall tunnels of Burton Green are put back on the table. Thank you very much.

383. My colleague Nick was going to follow me then to talk a little bit more about the environmental and ecology aspects. A few minutes it would take.

384. CHAIR: How long? How much?

385. MR HILLARD: Just a couple of minutes, Chair.

386. CHAIR: Okay, thank you.

387. MR HILLARD: That'll wrap up this section. Thank you. As John mentioned, my name's Nick Hillard and I'm the current Chairman of the Greenway Trust. I'm also a resident of Crackley and have been engaged in the HS2 project since its inception. I've worked in the environmental services sector for 20 years; I'm currently a sustainability manager for a large real estate advisory firm. Previously for six years, I was environment manager at the University of Warwick and, until recently, was a member of the All-Party Parliamentary Group for Biodiversity.

388. Following on from John, I'm looking to briefly pick up some of the aspects relating to environmental and social interest in the Greenway. I appreciate that you'll be hearing representations from specialist ecologists, acousticians, surveyors, geologists, hydrologists, health practitioners, etc., who are better able to articulate specific concerns in relation to their area of expertise. Indeed, the representation on 28 October from David Lowe, Chief Ecologist at Warwickshire County Council, was particularly interested in terms of landscape and habitat connectivity, and pertinent to the Greenway Trust purpose to promote the use of this linear asset within our community.

389. You'll appreciate from the slides that accompanied John's presentation that Greenway represents a hugely important feature in this area. It is a linear park, a multi-user highway, a sustainable transport corridor, a refuge for wildlife and a safe haven for parents to let their child run wild. The direct impact on the Greenway and its

users, throughout construction onwards into operation, has been assessed to an extent through the relevant section of the environmental statement. We have highlighted some of our concerns in relation to this direct impact associated with the current proposals, and would welcome ongoing dialogue with HS2 in relation to mitigation.

390. With the commitment of HS2 Limited to replace the Greenway in its entirety, the major long-term impact of the proposed scheme, as mentioned, would be the significant deterioration of peace and tranquillity of the area, with knock-on effects on the enjoyment of the Greenway.

391. Additionally, the Greenway and its interconnected network of wildlife corridors represent locally important migration pathways for many species of invertebrates and vertebrates. The maintenance of these linkages post-construction has been discussed by previous petitioners, so I won't dwell. However, the environmental statement acknowledges that the Kenilworth Greenway constitutes a key commuting route for the assemblage of bats identified, including noctule and Nathusius' pipistrelle, which are locally rare in Warwickshire. In addition to high-profile vertebrate species, I could wax lyrical about the records of scarlet elf cup fungus, purple hairstreak butterfly or glow worm, each of which depend on the Greenway to survive, and were picked out personally by the users who we surveyed recently.

392. Finally, on direct impacts, we are concerned that insufficient fieldwork has been undertaken to categorically assess the ecological value of the Greenway and, indeed, other sites up and down the route. In response to our petition, HS2 stated that the survey methods were based on standard approaches. This would be acceptable for a piecemeal development but not for HS2, we would content. We would argue that, for a scheme of this scale subject to such scrutiny, the bar should be set a lot higher, and I will come on to this in relation to the Greenway briefly, in due course. We've been informed that additional ecological surveys are underway in our area but, despite assurances received from HS2 that the extent of these surveys would be communicated, this has, as yet, not happened.

393. The impressive list of species that users of the Greenway reported was rightly highlighted by John. These are not necessarily nationally protected species and,

therefore, the impact of HS2 on them is not necessarily significant in the context of the environmental statement. However, they were important to those people who we surveyed and, therefore, their sighting had some value to them. This aspect of value, in relation to natural and, indeed, social capital is important to note. The subject was discussed at length at the APPG and is of growing interest, with an expanding body of research evidence, metrics and tools to quantify the benefits associated with the ecosystem services.

394. Biodiversity 2020 provides a strategy for England's wildlife and ecosystems services, and builds upon the work of the Natural Environment White Paper, the UK National Ecosystem Assessment and the Lawton review, 'Making Space for Nature'. You will be aware that we now have formally reporting of progress against Biodiversity 2020 indicators and also a natural capital committee that reports directly to the Treasury.

395. Coming back to the local context, these ecosystem services offered by the Greenway include provisioning, regulating, habitat supporting and cultural aspects, for example, biodiversity value with pollination, pest control, wildlife support, etc., and also the intrinsic value that John highlighted to the users. By its mere existence there, users have the opportunity to use the Greenway. In addition, we have climate regulation services, water quantity and quality, amenity value, recreation tourism and environmental effects upon health. We remain concerned that the combined value of these services is not adequately reflected in the relevant section of the environmental statement, and seek an undertaking that the collective benefit of these aspects will be included in future addenda.

396. Finally, HS2's sustainability policy commits the organisation to no net loss value to the natural environment and also openly reporting progress in delivering the commitments they make on sustainability. We would also like an undertaking that, based on the current design, this reporting commences henceforth.

397. In summary, therefore, John has discussed some of the direct impacts of the proposed scheme, in its current form, on the Greenway and its user and offered some opportunities for enhancement. I have tried to articulate some of the intangible benefits of the Greenway to its wealth of users, which we feel are not currently holistically

assessed. I have stressed the value of these aspects and identified policy initiatives that are seeking to protect these interests. We are simply looking for commitments from HS2 to engage in further dialogue with the Greenway Trust and to consider these aspects in the future refinement of the scheme. Thanks very much.

398. CHAIR: Thank you very much, gentlemen. We're now going to reconvene at two o'clock. Order, order. Thank you.