

MINUTES OF ORAL EVIDENCE

taken before

**HIGH SPEED RAIL COMMITTEE**

On the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON – WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

Monday, 14 December 2015 (Evening)

In Committee Room 5

PRESENT:

Mr Robert Syms (Chair)  
Mr Henry Bellingham  
Sir Peter Bottomley  
Geoffrey Clifton-Brown  
Mr David Crausby  
Mr Mark Hendrick

---

IN ATTENDANCE

Mr Timothy Mould QC, Lead Counsel, Department for Transport  
Mr James Strachan QC, Counsel, Department for Transport  
Ms Jacqueline Lean, Counsel, Department for Transport  
Mr Robin Purchas QC, representing Stephenson Way businesses and communities

WITNESSES

Mr Charles William  
Mr Ashraf Hussain  
Mr Andrew Dismore  
Ms Angela Hobsbaum and Ms Jean Dollimore  
Mr Simon Pearson and Mrs Diana Pearson  
Ms Eleanor Botwright, Ms Kathryn Gemmell and Mr Peter Lyons  
Mr Simon Pitkeathley and Mr Martin Sagar  
Ms Primavera Boman-Behram  
Mr Henry Conlon  
Mr Simon Lewis  
Mr Keith Farley, Mr David Clarke and Mr Scott Witchalls  
Dr Clive Edmunds, Mr Simon Chaplin and Mr Paul Parker  
Dr Helen Stokes-Lampard, Mr Richard Gladwell and Dr Alison Ohta  
Mr Larry Benjamin and Mr John Nyota

---

**IN PUBLIC SESSION**

## INDEX

Subject	Page
<u>Charles William</u>	
Submissions by Mr William	4
Response from Mr Strachan	7
<u>Timestart Ltd trading as Globe Motors</u>	
Submissions by Mr Hussain	10
Response from Mr Strachan	11
Closing submissions by Mr Hussain	15
<u>Andrew Hartley Dismore</u>	
Submissions by Mr Dismore	16
Response from Mr Strachan	23
Closing submissions by Mr Dismore	28
<u>Camden Cycling Campaign</u>	
Submissions by Ms Hobsbaum	29
Response from Mr Strachan	38
Closing submissions by Ms Hobsbaum	43
<u>Simon and Diana Pearson</u>	
Submissions by Mr Pearson	44
<u>The Castlehaven Community Association and others</u>	
Submissions by Ms Botwright	48
Submissions by Ms Gemmell	49
Submissions by Mr Lyons	50
Response from Mr Strachan	51
<u>Camden Town Centre Limited</u>	
Submissions by Mr Pitkeathley	54
Submissions by Mr Sagar	56
<u>Primavera R. Boman-Behram</u>	
Submissions by Ms Boman-Behram	58
Response from Ms Lean	61
Closing submissions by Ms Boman-Behram	63
<u>The Conlon Family and the Dublin Castle P.H.</u>	
Submissions by Mr Conlon	63
Response from Ms Lean	69
Closing submissions by Mr Conlon	72
<u>Simon Lewis and Regents Park Terrace Residents Association</u>	
Submissions by Mr Lewis	72
Response from Ms Lean	75

<u>Stephenson Way businesses and communities</u>	
Submissions by Mr Purchas	76
Mr Farley, examined by Mr Purchas	82
Mr Clarke, examined by Mr Purchas	94
Mr Witchalls, examined by Mr Purchas	103
Dr Edmunds, examined by Mr Purchas	107
Mr Chaplin, examined by Mr Purchas	111
Mr Parker, examined by Mr Purchas	114
Dr Stokes-Lampard, examined by Mr Purchas	116
Mr Gladwell, examined by Mr Purchas	118
Dr Ohta, examined by Mr Purchas	120
Mr Benjamin, examined by Mr Purchas	121
Mr Nyota, examined by Mr Purchas	124
Response from Mr Mould	125

(At 16.45)

1. CHAIR: Order, order. Welcome back to HS2 Select Committee. We now have petition 463 and 464, Charles William.

2. MR WILLIAM: Hello. Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Charles William. I have been a resident of the area since I was born and I've been in that area now for how old I am, 46 years. And I've been in the building of 115 Hampstead Road, which is - how do we mark it on the thing. Yep, just there - since 1981, and I run a professional services firm from the ground floor. And it's residential upstairs, which is where me and the whole family have lived.

3. We also have another property on Albany Street. It's further along Albany Street and the junction of Robert Street and Albany Street. That bit there. So just to give some context of where we are I've taken some pictures of our building of Hampstead Road, and that's a view from our building, from the roof, looking out. And that whole campus you see across the road and going up the road will all be taken over by Portakabins, I guess, as a site office and so on. And the road will be used as a main kind of through-route for construction vehicles and so on.

4. Let's look through a few more slides. Okay. That's just a view across, going towards Euston Station, on top of my building, and that's North Gower Street, the road which is going through those buildings there. And that's the Maria Fidelis School now. Again, another view. Again, a view up along Hampstead Road. If we can flip some more slides.

5. Okay, again, sorry, just go past this. These are the same slides, pretty much. Go forward one more. Again, just go forward, please, if we may. Again, please go forward. The road is a busy road, a main through road, Hampstead Road, and it's generally quite peaceful. There are - there is construction, or there's road - vehicles going up and down it, but nothing too significant.

6. What I'm looking at with my petition, the effect of HS2 is that for the next 18 years or so we're going to have this massive project happening on my doorstep, and I believe that there will be an impact on my building, on the - our - residential part of my building, as well as the commercial part of my building, and what I want to try and say

is that I've just discussed this stuff with a negotiator for HS2 recently, and we've both agreed that, yes, there will be an impact but we don't really know what kind of impact it would be.

7. So the project is a massive disruption to the way of life we currently enjoy, and will continue for the next two decades in my immediate area. HS2 have an enormous amount of material paperwork which deals with the local, national environment and impact assessments and so on, which runs into nearly 50,000 pages. I don't know; I haven't looked at it, but that's what Andy told me. It's massive. And as James has been working - James Strachan has been working on this for the last two years, he mentions that it's a scratch on the surface of how much volume of documentation there actually is.

8. Well, as a lay person it's difficult to go through and work out all the changes that are happening. So everyone agrees there will be an adverse impact on the local properties and business, and we've heard that from a few of the other petitioners that are just before me. And the question is the severity of the impact.

9. HS2 are going to great lengths to assure that the project will be done on a best-endeavours basis, to mitigate the adverse impact. However, I do not believe there is any provision in the bill, or by HS2, which allows for a layperson to address fair compensation or to work out solutions of problems they incur. With the assistance of a group of professionals who can act on behalf of the lay person, such as myself, in an unbiased - as an independent group of experts being available to people like me.

10. Myself, I do not have the funds to go out and search out an expert to go along and say 'What's going to be the impact assessment on me?' And if I - I have approached some chartered surveyors over the last couple of weeks, and they said 'As your land is not being acquired it's very difficult for you to - I mean, we agree that you're going to have an impact by what's happening, but it's going to be very difficult for you to go along and make a claim or to engage to prove your point.'

11. And so as a member of the public I don't have resources that HS2 have got. So the thing I want to try and say here is that - I'm not sure if this is exactly correct, but I have an analogy, which is that when BP had that oil spill in America they - a lot of people were affected by the spill which happened in 2010, and the public were able to

claim losses by making applications or claims through a Committee that was funded by BP for the purposes of facilitating those claims for people.

12. Now, whether it's a claim for financial redress or whether it's something which is not working according to the assurances that I've been given by HS2 that 'We're only going to have 40 extra lorries going down your road,' if they're just parked up outside the front of my building, what do I do? Where do I go with it? So whatever the causes or the problems would be, I believe that there has to be some process put in place to help the layperson to go along and make a claim, and to have professional help in making those claims.

13. So of course there shouldn't be a frivolous bundle of claims; there should be a process, a sensible process set up, but I believe that something needs to be put in place for the whole duration of the project so that people like myself can go along and make a - make a claim to an independent group, have access to experts, be it surveyors or people who can help and assist in trying to approach HS2 in making such a claim, and putting up our arguments or our problems forward. And that group should be funded by the whole of the HS2 project, for the local areas that they're impacting, I guess, even across the whole of the country, but especially around where I am, which is what's concerning me.

14. I've just got a little bit more to say, if I may. I do not know the impact of how HS2 is going to directly affect me. Andrew Davis said to me that he thinks that I will have minimal impact, but if one wants to look at some of the maps about where my building is in terms of the through route - if I could just refer to some of the drawings.

15. Okay, so P12790. So my building is on the red over there, and this is the whole construction site, and the ones which are marked in red, those roads like Robert Street and going past my building and going down over here - that's my building - and this whole area will be in existence as a site for - as a site office, as a construction area for stopping materials, and as a through route for the project.

16. I believe that we're going to be impacted for such a long time that nobody can really say what the impact is going to be like one year, three years and five years, and as the project keeps on developing. So what - and as I approached a few surveyors on the last little bit of time I would have to fund it out of my own pocket to try and get any

kind of regress, or any kind of diminishing in value.

17. The current compensation laws and the provisions within I think booklet number 2, I think part number 4, one of those compensation books, talks about where no land is acquired, and the only address for compensation would be under the guise of a diminishing in value. But to even progress such a claim, if it was even valid, would be extremely progressive. So one would need to be able to go along and fund that through the process.

18. As an immediate person being affected, I don't know - nor does the HS2 know whether - how bad I'll be affected, or how bad the whole process will be. So what I was going to say here was - so the project is known to cause extensive disruption for a prolonged period. To protect the public I believe that you need to give muscle power to this group, if you can set one up, and I would very much like you to.

19. I've spoken - as I've said. So the safeguarding Committee, or whatever it would be called, I hope that they're given enough teeth and power to function and look after people in the local area.

20. CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Does the petitioner qualify for any compensation, Mr Strachan?

21. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): No, not directly. That's because we don't take any land. We have written to the petitioner on 18 November 2015, P13147(1), and what we have done is seek to explain to the petitioner directly what the position is in respect of compensation, and we've set out under that paragraph the two instances when compensation would be payable, either under a part one claim under the 1973 act or a section 10 claim under the 1965 act if there were a diminution in the value of the land as a result of the construction works, where what we were doing might otherwise interfere with his rights.

22. That said, the reason why we don't anticipate that to be the case is because we seek to minimise the effects on surrounding properties, including this one. And could I just - if I show you P12793, just a zoomed-in plan for this area. It comes up quickly. As I said, the petitioner's property and business remains unaffected by the construction site, though obviously there will be some construction traffic in the vicinity travelling

along Hampstead Road.

23. And we have done assessments of the property in terms of, for example, resulting noise effects. P12795(1), the - I think the most noisy works in the vicinity are those - this is for an ID location close to the petitioner's property, which is day bridge construction works for Hampstead Road bridge, and the levels of the typical monthly outdoor levels are below those trigger levels which would otherwise require us to do anything.

24. So we're not predicting a significant effect from, for example, noise on the property. And although there will be construction post-2026 - and this is the station - of course the HS2 station will start to function in 10 years' time in 2026, and the station will be obviously - that part of the station functioning will be close to the petitioner's property where he runs his business we believe will derive some benefit from the regeneration of the eastern area.

25. MR WILLIAM: If I can go forward and say something. The construction site will not remain just for 10 years. It will go on for almost 20 years, and the station has been - the program has been extended from 10 to 17, maybe 18 years going forwards. But the main thrust of this request is that there should be funded by HS2 a group of professionals available for people to make redress claims, because to go out and engage a surveyor and obtain evidence to help us to even achieve a small claim, sometimes it's too expensive to even redress those.

26. And it may not just be financial stuff. It may be the fact that I need to push it for something else they're doing in the local area. We don't know what the losses or the effect will be in the local environment. So I do believe that my building will be affected, because Hampstead Road will be closed for about four, five years as I understand it roughly from Andrew Davis, going up towards Camden -

27. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Just to be clear, we don't -

28. CHAIR: No, no. It's not closed.

29. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): - close the road; keep it open. And the Hampstead Road Bridge continues in operation. There's always traffic that's able to -



30. MR WILLIAM: And then replace the bridge. And they said it's in effect about four years.

31. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes, but it's replaced with an off-line, so that we put in - we keep the traffic flowing over Hampstead Road throughout the construction period. We construct the bridge alongside it and project the central parts of the bridge that we create across the void.

32. MR WILLIAM: Okay. So that's a misunderstanding on my part but I do believe, though, we're going to have quite a significant impact which is unknown at the moment, and we don't know how much of a - how damaging it will be. We let our residential part of our building. It may become totally undesirable and we may have a fall in value for that reason alone, but we don't know.

33. As I believe, just to safeguard us, I am making a request that we can engage HS2 to put into place a safeguard for myself as well as anyone else in the local vicinity. It should be set up in such a manner that it avoids frivolous and silly claims, but something where people could get some fair redress.

34. CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much indeed.

35. MR WILLIAM: Thank you.

36. CHAIR: I now call AP3: 125, Maria Fidelis Roman Catholic Convent School. They've deferred? Not appearing? Okay. 1509, Quakers and Friends House London Hospitality Limited.

37. MR HUSSAIN: Sorry, you missed AP3: 139?

38. CHAIR: I don't have to take people in order. I will come back to you.

39. MR HUSSAIN: Okay.

40. CHAIR: Okay. I call again 1509, Quakers and Friends House London Hospitality Limited. They're grouped with the Stephenson Way people. I'm glad that's clear. 906, Camden Broadway Conservation Area Advisory Committee? 906, Camden Broadway Conservation Area Advisory Committee? Not here. Okay, we go to AP3: 139, Globe Motors.

### **Timestart Ltd trading as Globe Motors**

41. MR HUSSAIN: Good afternoon.
42. CHAIR: Good afternoon. Evening or afternoon.
43. MR HUSSAIN: First of all, thank you for giving us the opportunity to voice our concerns and present our ask. I'm Ashraf Hussain, one of the four petitioners and also representing Shohab and Mosharaf Hussain. Can we have the slide 102, please.
44. So if I start with introducing ourselves. Timestart Limited, trading as Globe Motors, is a family-run business in 12A, Mornington Crescent. The garage itself has been serving the local community for over 40 years, however Globe Motors, or Timestart Limited, started 15 years ago by Shohab, who is a director and mechanic, with a great deal of help from his family, including myself.
45. He is a lease holder and has been working at Globe Motors for 15 years. He has a young family with three children and is the only income earner. Mosharaf Hussein, who is also a director and mechanic and has been working here for most of his adulthood, and so 10 years.
46. As I said earlier, I'm the co-lease holder of 12A Mornington Crescent. We have -
47. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Can we just look briefly at 12518, just to get the location?
48. MR HUSSAIN: My next slide I do have the location for you.
49. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Because this helps a bit more, because - thank you.
50. MR HUSSAIN: Just with that, apart from the business, all three of us have a very close connection with the Camden community. I think our connection dates back two generations. My grandfather started his home in Camden in the 60s, and we were all brought up - born and in Camden.
51. So where are we located? As you can see, this picture has been taken from Mornington Crescent itself. On the top-left, that's the junction serving Mornington Crescent and serving as the main access point for our customers, especially

from the south of the garage. The garage itself is on Clarkson Row, and I just want to point out the junction here, which is the main junction, is going to be facing a lot of disruption and due to be closed for access for a period of two years. Can I have the next slide, please?

52. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Sorry, 'closed' you can't get into Clarkson Row, or 'closed' you can't get out at the other end?

53. MR HUSSAIN: You can't get in or out, I believe, into Mornington Crescent. So although the official address for the building is 12A Mornington Crescent it actually faces onto Mornington Terrace and Clarkson Row. You can see here the close proximity of the actual proposed HS2 line. This is parapet wall. And here, for the actual Camden Cutting -

54. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: This is looking south down towards Euston Station?

55. MR HUSSAIN: If you're looking south that's Euston Station, yes.

56. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Yes.

57. MR HUSSAIN: So this view here, taken from Mornington Terrace, a few metres away from Mornington Street Bridge, which is due to be closed I believe 2017 for a period of five years, and that is one of the second - well, the second-most important access to the garage. If we can have the next slide, please.

58. So where does HS2 leave us? Hopefully physically in the same physical location, but unfortunately our environment and surrounding changes hugely. We will have road works and utility diversion works taking place at our doorstep for around 30 months. Nearly every road around us forms part of the construction traffic route, and HGVs will be travelling frequently past the garage, and that will last for between eight and 16 years.

59. So I've highlighted in the yellow boxes some key access points and roads that serve the garage and are instrumental to the business, and as you can see - I'm not going to read it out, but they are all due to be closed temporarily, long term, short term, but they all serve the access to the garage.

60. We're going to also be surrounded by 19 construction compounds and 17 satellite compounds, and as I said there's going to be traffic flowing all around the garage itself. There's also going to be noise and disruption as a result of this. Can we have the next slide, please?

61. So my intention isn't to repeat, line by line, what was in our petition. I think we had 14 parts and various other concerns. So I'm not going to repeat all of them, and summarise some of the key ones.

62. You'll appreciate that for any garage business, for it to run successfully or for it to even survive, unhindered, congestion-free easy access is an absolute must. As you've seen in a slide earlier, we are hugely affected by the road works proposed and the construction traffic route, so our main concerns are that there is no fair compensation for those in our situation and there is no security provided to maintain our business or mitigate against the risk.

63. Construction traffic and disruption, as I explained earlier, is of main concern. We are extremely concerned that this will result in loss of our customers. As you will appreciate, the diversions and the closures will eventually drive the customers away from trying to fight the congestion and visit the garage. They will probably take their custom elsewhere.

64. Apart from the actual loss suffered there we will subject to employing resources to support us tackle the problem during that construction phase, and as I said the key roads serving the garage will be closed. This will eventually result in a loss of main household income for the two gentlemen running the garage, and one of the workers. It also will end up with some emotional stress and pain for those individuals and their families, and we believe that the promoter has not considered this, or that impact. Can we move to the next slide, please?

65. So as I said earlier, I'm not listing every single ask here, but they still stand, what's in our petition. But we understand that HS2 and the Euston Station may provide long-term benefit for the area and economy. But we ask that due consideration is given to people and business like us.

66. For example, we asked that the compensation scheme, or the cash offer that's been

provided to rural areas are extended to the urban areas and also business lease holders. This will mainly allow - or give us some buffer to mitigate against the potential risk of losing the business. We could probably implement certain measures like extend different strategies or amenities, et cetera, if we had that kind of resource to play with.

67. And we ask that - we understand there's the business and local economy fund that's been introduced, and we would like written assurance that we, as a business, will benefit from such funds.

68. In terms of the construction traffic disturbance, we do ask that the promoters revisit the construction program methodology, in particular to Hampstead Bridge road works and Mornington Street bridge, with cognizance to the operation and impact to the actual garage itself, and maintain vehicle - so whatever plans they reconsider, we ask that they look at ways of maintaining key access roads and routes to the garage.

69. We also want to work with the promoters and we ask that they do the same, so give us some specific undertaking and assurance in relation to all of this in advance. We want to work with them so we can mitigate against our losses and ask them to collaborate and engage with us, and that could take different forms, including promotion, giving us advertising space, signage, postage for our business, encouraging and committing their undertakers, contractors to make use of the garage. So I believe this will help us produce or recover some of the losses that the business will suffer. All we say is, just because it's a small garage, it shouldn't be ignored and should be included in any steering group or any working group. I think that's it from me.

70. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): P11318, please. Can I reassure the Petitioner that the fact that it's a small business does not mean that it's ignored? Can I just deal with the construction effects and then I'll come to some of the specific assurances which will benefit the Petitioner? Just to remind the Committee, we don't take the Petitioner's property. In this location here, just over here with the blue line, we do shut the bottom of the Mornington Crescent for two years, but we maintain access because Mornington Crescent is a two-way street with another access onto Hampstead Road and that's not shut, and we don't shut Clarkson Row at any point during the construction, which is the road on which the premises lie.

71. So there's always access into and out of the garage throughout the construction

period, and there is just that two year period where we have to do the work for Hampstead Road, where the bottom end of Mornington Crescent is shut. We do of course shut the Mornington Street Bridge for construction, but there are accesses into this general location. Then can I turn to the specific assurances which are designed to deal with the effect of construction on businesses? P13152(1) is a letter we wrote to Mr Hussain on 4 December, and there are a number of general assurances which are designed to deal with the impact of construction traffic generally. Assurance 1 repeats that which we provided to Camden.

72. If we can go to the next page, please, P13152(2). You'll see we've got some general assurances on reducing traffic, which I know were of concern, and then P13152(3), can I just draw attention to clause 3? There are three things of note. First of all, there is of course the business and local economy fund. Secondly, you'll see that HS2 has committed to requiring its contractors to participate in the community investment program, similar to that which Crossrail operates and we're looking at the scope of the CIP for inclusion in the works instructions to be ready for the invitation to tender the process that will begin in 2016.

73. Then thirdly, the third element of the specific assurances we've offered to the London Borough of Camden, of direct relevance to the garage as a business in the area, what we are proposing to do is develop a business support strategy which will be subject to review by the EPIB, and that will include consideration of the very things that the garage is interested in, namely the engagement both before and during construction, and of course things such as business promotion and marketing for businesses affected in the area, support for the business operations affected by the works and indeed widen business support activities.

74. If we go to the next page, please, paragraph 4. You can see, in addition, we will have signposting on hoarding as identified in section 5.6, and then, in relation to traffic management and indeed those sorts of road closures that we're talking about, there is a requirement to go through this process of discussion with the relevant highway authority and other relevant stakeholders to address things such as road closures and their duration. All of those things are designed to minimise the effects on businesses and indeed, potentially, where there is an opportunity for a spin-off benefit for local business to be used to factor that into the strategy that we are setting out in this assurance.

75. MR HUSSAIN: Can I just add a point? The term 'general assurance', yes, I did have a meeting on 23 November with Ella Davies, so thank you for that, Ella, and this letter is in response to our meeting. As probably you can see, most of the assurances have been generic and general, not specific to the garage. That is our concern, and I want to endorse what Charles William, the previous petitioner, was saying about setting up a Committee that can help people like us, the layman or the small businesses, to put a claim together or whatever support we need. So, yes, it's general.

76. As I say, there's nothing specific there, and at the same time, I understand the CIP programme, but why I said we're a small garage and why we still feel vulnerable; because the little knowledge I have of how the procurement process works in the public sector, I don't think we will make the PQQ stage, let alone the CIP stage. So I don't think the assurances given there do really help us. It needs to be specific and, as I said, it's a garage. It's a small garage that's been serving the community for 40 years. There are a shortage of garages and it's not just a business, it's our connection with the longstanding community, and it needs to be written more specifically, the assurances.

77. All we're asking for is some kind of security so we can maintain this business and work with us. There are ways of minimising the disruption on the roads as I'm sure you know, the promoters will be maximising the use of the railway. I understand it's hard to get railway possession, but at the same time, we've got to try to maintain the business around us.

78. CHAIR: Okay. We'll take that as your final plea and we'll reflect on what you've said. I think you do have a good point, that where there are local businesses, small businesses, being disrupted, I don't think it unreasonable, if possible, for the contractors locally to put work in your direction. I've noticed about Central London, it's very difficult to find garages these days. A lot of them turn into blocks of flats. Anyway. Thank you very much for putting your case to the Committee. Right. We now go to 732, AP3: 3, Andrew Dismore, member of London Assembly and late of this parish. Welcome, Andrew.

**Andrew Hartley Dismore**

79. MR DISMORE: Thank you, Chair. I suppose it's good to be back, but I'm glad I'm not doing your job.

80. CHAIR: Well you're on the Standards Committee. I wouldn't have that job.

81. MR DISMORE: Okay, shall I start?

82. CHAIR: Yes.

83. MR DISMORE: What I want to do is to go over a lot of the ground that you've seen already. So I do stand by my petitions, but I'm not going to go through the detail of most of that. There's no point, because you've covered a lot of that already, and I know Keir is going to go through compensation with you, I think, tomorrow, so I'm not going to deal with that either. I do want to say a few things about mitigation, because whilst mitigation reduce the adverse impact of the works, we are going to see these for 17 years and it's going to be quite a blight on a lot of people for a lot of time. I want to deal firstly with the question of community engagement. Could I see slide A16963, please? This is just a quick point.

84. CHAIR: The system is slowing a bit, because it's got so many documents on it. We were taking bets at the beginning of the process how many...

85. MR DISMORE: Yeah, okay. Can't get it. Oh well. Well, if we had got the slide, what I was going to try and illustrate on the slide is the different between the Kings Cross opportunity area, which is effectively a very large brownfield site, the Tottenham Court Road one, which is effectively a business site, and Euston opportunity area, which is almost entirely residential, apart from the businesses you've been hearing from. This is not a brownfield site, and it does need therefore to have some consideration for the residents who live there, and I've been involved as the assembly member for almost four years. I've attended many meetings, by no means all, and I share the frustration of that community who asked many reasonable questions but got very little in the way of answers.

86. There's very little trust between the community and HS2, and that stretches beyond the community to me and other elected representatives as well. We've seen continuity of HS2 representatives dealing with the public. We've had four different people in four different years, and HS2 seem to judge the output by the number of meetings rather than the outcomes that are achieved for residents. In fact, for example, we wasted six months just discussing the terms of reference for these meetings, and it



seems to me that HS2 are incapable of negotiating with the community, and a lot of the issues that you're having to deal with now could have been resolved rather than seeing these repeated concerns expressed time and again to your Committee.

87. I'll give you an example. After four years of community engagement, we still don't know which homes will have what work done and when for noise mitigation work, even for those that are obviously going to be affected, and that's the sort of thing that could easily have been resolved with some proper negotiation and discussion with the community. That's the context. I'm particularly interested now in the future engagement with the community, which is going to be via Camden Council, I guess. What I'm concerned about in the Camden letter of assurance is that seems to be more about dissemination of information, rather than actual engagement with the community, allowing the community to influence the process.

88. The concern is that it's going to be the same old, rather than a real and effective system, rather than theoretical and illusionary, and I think one of the concerns is that the Camden document has Health and Safety at Work Act language and a lot of reasonable practicabilities which give a lot of room for manoeuvre. So I think we need to have key performance indicators to monitor effective change and regular feedback and outcomes, and that's the first thing I'd ask for. I think we need to have some form of community representation on the ESSRB. Meetings in public, you can of course have reserve meetings to discuss matters which are quite rightly confidential, but we all know public bodies do meet in large part in public and I think it would do an awful lot for transparency about the process if that were the case here.

89. Above all, I think we need to see a fundamental change in corporate attitude, which seems to be – the corporate culture of HS2 is make it happen, don't listen, plough on, and that has created this great ill feeling amongst the community, which I think you've seen expressed as these hearings have gone on. I think we need to see an independent complaints commissioner with enforcement powers. We've seen in the Crossrail complaints commissioner somebody who is there, but it seems to take an awful long time to go anywhere, and I've got examples which I won't go through, of trying to resolve complaints and the Commissioner in the end hasn't got much power to do anything. If I go on to Euston Station. Have we got slides 169622? I did send this list in, so...

90. CHAIR: Okay. Well, we have them in a file in front of us anyway, so you can speak to your...

91. MR DISMORE: Well, what these slides illustrate – 169622 and 169621. No? Well, I think the point I want to make here is the need for Crossrail 2 and phase 2 to be funded and integrated together, not seen as separate projects. I know the ESSRB terms of reference involve Camden overseeing A to D on all the different phases, but in fact they are all split up, and you'll see all the different phases here. HS2 is here, then you've got the old station and you've got the impact on Somers Town, which is what I'm particularly concerned about, which is particularly illustrated on slide 21 and 22, it's block 5 on 21, and the problem here is the impact – we can't get the slides unfortunately.

92. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: We're on the Somers Town area?

93. MR DISMORE: The Somers Town area.

94. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Where we saw the playground and various other things behind the church.

95. MR DISMORE: Yeah. The point about this is, because this is not being done as a project altogether, we're going to lose potentially an extra 130 homes and seven businesses in the Somers Town area for Crossrail 2, because Crossrail 2 now has to take on these sites in Somers Town, because of the uncertainty over what's going to happen with the classic station. It makes a lot more sense to do the whole thing in one go with the Crossrail 2 station integrated into the classic station, integrated into the whole. I would hope the Committee will regard it as important that all the projects over and above those set out in the bill are done together and in time.

96. Euston needs to be funded as a comprehensive development package and not split up, to minimise the impact on the community directly affected by HS2, but also the community in Somers Town and further afield.

97. CHAIR: I think we got the point that it needs to be planned as an overall project. Whether or not it's phased in terms of funding, which I think is probably more likely, but we certainly pick up the point about the impact of Crossrail 2 on the community as

well, having difficulties and then having further difficulties, which can be planned away, if done together.

98. MR DISMORE: Okay. Can I go onto mitigation? The concern here is the work that's starting under the Paving Act, and last week, it was indicated that by starting the utility works first, HS2 won't put in place the noise mitigation package until the next phase of work that's coming under the bill commences, and the reason for this that, although the figure, the highest level of noise, that's the utility works in the street, they don't show you the noise mitigation methods, because noise levels are not exceeded for a sufficiently long period. We want to wait for the Hybrid Bill before doing sound insulation.

99. Now, you do actually have, in the green fold-out, the first slide, even if we haven't got it on the screen, the actual slide number is A1678112. Can we get that one? No. We can see in here the area that's affected, that one...

100. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: We've got it down as 17742.

101. MR DISMORE : Ah, hooray, yes. That one. So you can see from here how wide the area potentially affected by sound insulation is, and if we've got the next slide, which is 11848(17), by any chance? All right.

102. MR CLIFTON-BROWN: No.

103. MR DISMORE: Oh well. P1184817. No?

104. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Which shows?

105. MR DISMORE: Which shows the extent of the utility works. In fact, there are two slides. One is the wider area and the other one is Mornington Terrace, which shows in a bit more detail just one of the utility sites. The point about it is that the list of works to trigger mitigation doesn't include, for example, utilities diversions, nor, for example, the construction of maintenance compounds, all of which are incredibly noisy works, and a particular practical problem will arise if there's insulation at a later stage, because by then we'll have road closures in place, parking suspensions and so. So even if they want to do mitigation work, getting the vans in to install the double glazing or whatever it happens to be, is going to be that much harder than doing it from the beginning.

106. It is work that's going to have to be done anyway. Why do it from the start to protect everybody from as much noise as they possibly can, including the most noisy, which is the utility works? Some of which will go on for some considerable time, even if they are temporary works. So my ask is that HS2 should look at the whole program of works to see if the whole package qualifies, and if the whole package does qualify, then the sound insulation should be put in place before any work is done, including digging up the roads and any demolition for creating the work sites. There's also an issue around the noise insulation quality.

107. In the Mornington Terrace evidence, I think it was quite recently, they asked for confirmation that all building regulations would be applied when assessing the impacts on a house of the noise insulation package. The response was, I quote: 'I'm sure petitioners will understand it would not be appropriate to apply all buildings regulations that apply to new building'. Well, obviously, for example, things to do with energy conservation, we'd accept that, but I think the argument here is that those that relate to health and safety should be put in place, because I think that most people would accept that health and safety regulations, so far as the other regulations ought to be applied; those that deal with heat ventilation, damp, fire and noise and so on.

108. We haven't an answer to that as yet. I think we also want to see the independent advisory service, as proposed by the local authority noise consortium, for residents to access advice in relation to noise insulation. Going on to the issue of traffic, I'm going to try my luck again, slide P11315(6), P11315(5). Looks like that. I'm just getting a little bit ahead of myself to see if I can find it while I'm making a point.

109. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: It's the pattern of vehicle movements?

110. MR DISMORE: Yes.

111. MR CLIFTON-BROWN: Are they under a different number? Is that possible?

112. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): This is in the pack of exhibits, so I think...

113. MR CLIFTON-BROWN: Under which tab?

114. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I don't know, because I wasn't the one citing it. I think it's in the tab E, I think.

115. MR HENDRICK: It's not there, is it?

116. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): No. I think Mr Dismore was referring to slides in the Euston Standard Pack, which I think is P11315, if you can...

117. MR DISMORE: Anyway. I did send a list in last week, but there you go. That's life. What's new? Same old. Well, I'll make the points anyway.

118. CHAIR: Yeah.

119. MR DISMORE: The traffic modelling has been done on strategic roads only. Displacement of traffic has been predicted in their diversionary flows assessment onto secondary roads. There's been no modelling done to see if the secondary i.e. residential roads can take the level of traffic flows after diversions. So we've got no real idea what needs to be put in place as a consequence of this, and if we look at the volume of traffic, that's what the blue and orange lines show, the blue lines – ah, hooray, yes. Which one are we on? Yeah, the top one. That's it.

120. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: On three...

121. MR DISMORE: Five, that's it. 3.55, that's it. If we look at this one, the blue lines are the spoil traffic, and even if that was taken out by rail, taking 75 per cent of it, you'll still see there's a huge problem left, which is the orange lines, and the first question is: why can't some of the inward materials like concrete and steel be transported by rail? If they're bringing empty trucks in, they might as well have something in them before they take them out again with a spoil on.

122. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: It might be because the trucks are different.

123. MR DISMORE: Yeah, but the point I'm making is, we've still got a lot of traffic here. If you take the example of Delancey Street, this is going to be used as a construction route, there'll be an extra 40 or so HGVs coming down there. Not a large impact in itself, but what we don't know is what the estimate of the other HS2 traffic and public traffic is going to be on that road. I think there's a real risk of gridlock, if we look at Hampstead Bridge works for example, and all the lane closures at the junction of Parkway and Delancey Street. This could cause complete gridlock. Now, as well as being on the London Assembly, I'm also a member of the Fire Authority, and I'm very

concerned about the impact on emergency vehicles, particularly Fire Authority vehicles, the Fire Brigade.

124. We've had a couple of fires recently, persons reported north of Euston Road, one in Camden Road and one in Belsize, and it took the fire engines from south of Euston Road, because the other ones were out, over a quarter of an hour to get there, which made it very difficult indeed when the target time is actually six minutes. Luckily, in the first one, nobody was injured. In the second one, somebody did die, but whether it was a consequence of the fire engine not getting there on time we have to wait for the inquest. So I'm very concerned about the impact on emergency services, particularly Fire Authority, which I represent, but also the ambulance service which was recently put into special measures.

125. It's no real answer to say people can do it on blue light, even if you're on blue lights, if the traffic is gridlocked up, it's still got to get through and it still takes time to work its way through. I'm also concerned about Euston Road and the need for pedestrians and cyclists to get across what is a pretty impenetrable barrier under the proposals. The last points I want to raise relate to air quality. For this, I'd like slide, if we can find it, P11248(5). No? Ah, hooray. Yes, good. Okay.

126. CHAIR: That surprised you, didn't it?

127. MR DISMORE: It did rather, yeah. Well, there you go. The last is always the best. HS2 are only monitoring the main roads for air quality, and if we look at the impact of 800 HGVs on Euston Road, which is already heavily polluted, are to the current traffic about 40,000 a day on Euston Road, it's not going to make a huge impact, but no monitoring is being done at points on the residential secondary roads to establish year-long baseline levels. Now, the red blobs you see here are predictions of substantial and moderate adverse air quality effects, including many on residential roads, but what they're based on, there is no baseline monitoring data.

128. It's claimed that this will include diversionary flows, but as there's been no local road modelling done, which I referred to earlier on, how can these be reliable as they stand? So the ask here is that we need to have monitoring of air quality now where levels are much lower prior to any HS2 changes, and obviously, rather than on the trunk roads, so the level of increase can be established over the period when HS2 comes in.

So I hope we can have the Committee recommending that there should be baseline air quality monitoring in the residential areas for a year, so we can actually see what the impact is going to be once the traffic is diverted and the air quality starts to deteriorate in the residential roads, as opposed to trunk roads where the work has been directed. That's it.

129. CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much, Andrew. Mr Strachan?

130. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes. Firstly, in relation to community engagement, can I just obviously refer to the amount of community engagement that has taken place? We haven't always seen eye to eye, obviously, on all the issues, but there has been extensive community engagement, and of course, a number of assurances have come into place before petitioners reached the Committee to resolve issues. Obviously, they can't resolve everything by way of discussion, but perhaps more positively, if I could just refer you to the Camden assurance, P11427, page 10, you'll see that there is a process there for yet further engagement to take place, both for the design development of Euston Station, that's on P11427(10), and assurance for public engagement in the design development of Euston Station.

131. 4.2, we have offered assurance to engage with the London Borough of Camden on the development on the community engagement framework aimed at ensuring all sections of the community, including businesses and individuals, are made aware of developments in relation to the construction program and local impacts. So there are two process of further engagement to go forward. One relates to the whole of the Euston Station design, and the second is specifically designed to deal with construction impacts and assuring everyone is aware of what is going on. Those are then coupled with the provisions about advance information, to try and minimise the effects.

132. MR CLIFTON-BROWN: Mr Strachan, I think Mr Dismore's point was that these meetings should be in public to aid transparency.

133. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Well, that community engagement process will be public. I think Mr Dismore was probably directing that particular comment to the strategic board, which is a separate board that is set up under the assurances with Camden and TfL. You've seen those assurances previously. I'll just refer you to those. That is a board which will work under paragraph 1 of the Camden assurance on page 3,

which we haven't got up yet. See, it's not just you, Mr Dismore. The system, I'm afraid, is not functioning well today, but P11427(3) for the record, that is the clause dealing with delivering Euston Station, working collaboratively. There's a similar assurance for TfL as well.

134. That sets out a process for the participation of the Euston Strategic Board with appropriate governance arrangements with membership of that board to deal with the wider strategic issues for the Euston area. It picks up on a point about Crossrail, because one of the things that that board is going to do looking forward is to look at the more strategic issues for the redevelopment of Euston Station, and the integration of a number of projects in the area, not just with HS2 Euston Station, but the mainline station, Crossrail 2 proposals at Euston and other oversight development under the Euston area plan.

135. The membership of that, that is intended to be a strategic board where confidential commercial matters can be discussed and that's why that strategic board has the membership it does. It's not intended to be a public forum, but it's intended to look at the strategic issues for those particular bodies, both of whom, as I've said, London Borough of Camden and TfL of course, representing wider public interests. So I think that's what that point was directed at, but that's an explanation of why that board has the membership it does. That's not to say of course there isn't detailed public participation in the design of Euston Station through the assurance I've just read out.

136. The details of which under clause 4 set out some of the measures that have been taken – 4.1, we can't get it on the screen, but I'll just give you a flavour of it, 'open engagement exercise with public exhibitions, leaflet drops, interactive online materials and related publicity'. That has to occur in 2016, no later than six months following the appointment of the design teams on preferred options for the design of Euston Station, and a preferred prior to submissions to the planning authority for approval. That's a separate process of public engagement, with some very specific measures designed to engage everyone in the area in the design of the Euston Station.

137. That's distinct from the more strategic issues where those other projects are going to be looked at to secure an integrated approach to Euston itself. So there is quite a lot of meat in the assurance, which I can't unfortunately on the screen, but it is – that



engagement clause 4 of the letter. The complaints commissioner, I think you've already heard about the construction commissioner, the way it's intended to operate and the ultimate sanctions elevated up, if necessary, to Secretary of State. Of course, we hope that won't be necessary. I think the Crossrail 2, I've dealt with – is covered under that way forward for TfL and Camden.

138. Utility works, can I just emphasise, utility works have been assessed as part of the environmental statement as works which form part of the project. So the traffic effects of them have been identified, the noise effects of them have been identified, consequential disruption has been assessed, and of course, a realistic worst case scenario has been put forward, but we – where there's noise insulation that's been identified as necessary for properties, it is generally not as a result of utility works, because of the relatively short duration of those sorts of works which are very much of the type which would occur in a road with normal utility works, with a rolling program.

139. That said, bearing in mind the assurance we've given to Camden about noise insulation, the process for surveying, taking place in the spring of 2016, and the desire to get it in as soon as reasonably practicable, as it happens, the process of that process is likely to lead to noise insulation going in earlier rather than later. It will need to be in before any works occur, which are the trigger for noise insulation. As I previously explained, the assurances we've given as to the program is likely to lead to in going in earlier than it's actually required, and that will of course have a knock-on benefit for works that may be going on before the noise works that trigger it. Likewise, if noise insulation stays in place, it also has knock-on benefits for the residents.

140. That's the program is currently working. Of course, you've heard already about the process for going into properties to look on a site-by-site basis as to what is required and the most effective way to deal with them, bearing in mind their characteristics, and of course whether they're listed or whatever.

141. MR CLIFTON-BROWN: Sorry, Mr Strachan, before you move off that, could you give an answer to Mr Dismore's point about building regulations? Because building regulations or noise have changed considerably over the last few months and they are few stringent than they were, involving things like insulating walls where noise is a problem. This could have a very expensive effect on the HS2 project. So I think we

need a fairly careful answer on that.

142. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): The general position is that our works don't disapply other pieces of legislation less specifically provided for in the Bill. So we're not disapplying, for example, health and safety legislation which might otherwise be application, and noise insulation which is put in will have to be done safely to ensure the property is safe. What I think Mr Dismore may have been referring to are building regulations which would be applicable to a new property, and there are different building regulation standards that apply to new properties, which relate to, for example, energy efficiency.

143. They may also relate to some of the internal design properties, some of which would now be designed to very different standards of that which you might find currently in, for example, Mornington Terrace, which is what he referred to. Those are older buildings. They will have internal designs which wouldn't necessarily meet modern building regulations for a new property. In putting in noise insulation, we're not going to be doing anything that's unsafe in that sense. We will be required to comply with the legislation which is applicable to putting in noise insulation and the relevant building regulations that apply to that noise insulation if you're inserting it into a property.

144. What we're not signing up to, and I don't think anyone could reasonably sign up, is meeting all building regulations for any such property, which would apply to a new-build property. So I hope that gives some level of reassurance, but what we can't do is do works to a property which wouldn't be required, particularly for some of these older buildings which are not new-build and couldn't be expected to comply with all building regulations. There is something specific, and I think it might be in IPE23. I'm just trying to lay my hands on it, which talks about compliance with relevant building regulations on mechanical ventilation standards and might be double glazing or secondary glazing, but not as if it's a new-build property.

145. So I think that's the only difference between us. If I've got that wrong, then let me know. On the traffic assessments, just to be clear, we do assess for the traffic effects, including diversionary traffic effects for the wider area. There's some very detailed traffic modelling that has been done and updated in light of the further AP3 and

supplementary environmental statement, and on top of that of course, the Committee will be well aware of our need for transport management plans to be agreed with the highway authority, to avoid the gridlock which Mr Dismore has referred to, and specifically, to consult with the emergency services as part of the formulation of those traffic management plans, because we are well aware and want to secure continued emergency access for properties as you'd expect.

146. That's part of the process of the detailed approval of the transport management plans that we will have to go through. I'll see if I can find that reference to the noise insulation package, but other than that, those are the principal points. Sorry, I should just refer to air quality. There's an air quality assurance that's been provided to Camden, which applies on a route-wide basis, which we've shown you before. That deals with the process of how air quality will be dealt with. We are focussing on anywhere there are identified significant environmental effects. There has already been data used for the model to be created for air quality effects to be predicted.

147. Some of that is existing monitoring or monitoring stations in local areas, existing baseline data that exists from, I think, either Camden or TfL, I forget which, and then a further process of where we're identifying significant effects on very much a realistic, worst case scenario. So we're using the peak levels of traffic. We're showing certain, very conservative assumptions. That then leads forward to the basis for the further work that will take place, which has been the subject of an assurance provided to Camden, I think – I'll just give you the reference, P11422 – and then a subsequent assurance, P11418, which is set out in a letter to Camden dated 27 November 2015, dealing with air pollution monitoring pre and during construction, and the approach which has been agreed with the London Borough of Camden as to the correct way to go about the future monitoring of air quality is in this area, arising from construction.

148. CHAIR: Okay.

149. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Reference to the relevant building is in 10.3 of our assurance given to the London Borough of Camden in that long letter which was first in compliance with the relevant building regulations so far as noise insulation and mechanical ventilation is concerned.

150. CHAIR: Thank you. Brief final comments?

151. MR DISMORE: Yes. Community engagement. As I said, HS2 monitor it by the number of meetings rather than the outcomes of those meetings. As far as I'm aware, only Camden Cutting Group have had any assurances out of this process as far as residents groups are concerned. I think that when Mr Strachan says the Camden assurance says that people were made aware of what's going on, that's exactly the point. People don't want to be made aware – well, they do want to be made aware – but providing information isn't the same as allowing people to influence the process. That's what people want to be able to do, to influence the process, not simply be treated like mushrooms, which is what they're particularly worried about.

152. As far as the ESSRB is concerned, of course, I fully accept that its meetings can't entirely be in public, but a lot of it can be. If it's dealing with broad scale strategic issues, a lot of those meetings could be in public. We've all been in public life. We've all seen local authorities meet partly in public, partly in private. There's no reason why commercial confidential material couldn't be dealt with in private and broad strategic considerations dealt with in public. I think it's really important that we do have some community representation on that board, of course subject to the same criteria as anybody else on a public board.

153. As far as the utility works are concerned, it depends on what you mean by 'short duration', I think, and if that work is going to have to be done anyway for noise insulation, I can't honestly see what the objection is to doing it before the whole of the program starts, including the utility redirection works, some of which are going to be extremely noisy, extremely big and will go on for some time. Obviously not the 18 years whatever it is for HS2 as a whole, but certainly some of it will be potentially months, I think. It would actually be far more practical to do it before the whole thing rather than afterwards.

154. As far as the traffic and air quality issue is concerned, the point I make here is: where is the baseline for the residential areas on air quality? Those statistics don't exist. You can try and do predictions, but it's not the same as actually measuring the residential areas baseline air quality, and that's what we're asking for.

155. CHAIR: Thank you very much. Nice to see you again as well.

156. MR DISMORE: Thank you.

157. CHAIR: You're looking very well. Right. Now we go onto the Camden Cycling Campaign, 861, AP3: 92. Welcome. I know you've been waiting patiently at the back. I hope we can go speedily through the slides. Always remember that Sir Peter can read a lot faster than you can say them. Who is going to kick off?

### **Camden Cycling Campaign**

158. MS HOBBSBAUM: I'm Angela Hobsbaum. I am representing Camden Cycling Campaign. My colleague, Jean Dollimore, was the coordinator before me and what she doesn't know about cycle routes in Camden is so trivial, we won't be bothered with it. Okay, the first slide which is on the screen has all the details of our asks so there are no surprises in store. So let's move on to the second slide. Camden Cycling Campaign is the local group of the London Cycling Campaign, which is an organisation with over 12,000 members and 40,000 supporters. It campaigns for safer cycling in London.

159. Unlike the CTC in Buckinghamshire which you've already heard from some months ago, our members are mainly commuters. They are not leisure or sports cyclists, although they may be that in their spare time, but most of the people that we're concerned about are people who use bikes to get around. They go the shops, they go to work, they go to college, they go to see friends on their bikes. I know that you will have also heard cycling mentioned in the petitions from Camden and from TfL and from Andrew Dismore and the Camden Cuttings Group, but here, it's our main focus. I know that some members of the Committee have been sympathetic to cycling in the past and been supportive of cycling, so I'm hoping that that sympathy will extend to us too.

160. Next slide, please. In this presentation, this is what we're going to focus on. These are the six main sections of our presentation. Section 3 is the longest. I will try to rattle through it. If necessarily, I will omit some of the slides if they seem to be too detailed. Could we have the next slide, please? In 2013, the Mayor of London said: 'I want cycling to be normal. A part of everyday life. I want more women cycling, more older people cycling, more black and minority ethnic Londoners cycling, more cyclists of all social backgrounds'. That was his aim and his vision and we welcome it, and we're very pleased to see HS2's endorsement of it as well.

161. Given the predicted increase in London's population, 10 million by 2029, before the end of HS2, it's imperative to encourage people to get out of their cars and to walk

or cycle, because otherwise, the transport system will grind to a halt. Every person on a bike is one less person taking up a seat on a tube or on a bus, and since the buses and tubes are practically at capacity now, we need to encourage more people to take up active means of transport, including cycling. Cycling is cheap. It's healthy. Every cyclist on the road makes more space for other people there. By planning for cycling from the beginning, HS2 has the opportunity to integrate cycling into its traffic strategy. Could we have the next slide please? If cycling has doubled in the last ten years, think what it's going to do in the next 15. The mayor has predicted that cycling across London will double by 2023. So that's why HS2 needs to be planning to accommodate many thousands more cyclists by the time its operations finish. Cycling can't be planned for as an afterthought. We have to plan for safe cycling from the beginning of this project.

162. In particular, since so many cyclists are crossing Euston Road to get to Bloomsbury, to get down to the Universities, to get to the City or to the West End, the crossings of Euston Road are a particular concern. So, it's vital to create safe junctions here. The HS2 will have a major impact on routes in that area. So, that's our kind of preamble. Could I have the next slide please?

163. I'm sure it's already been stated many times that HGVs are not good news for cyclists. They're the main source of serious accidents for cyclists. In London so far this year, nine cyclists have been killed. Seven of these in collisions with HGVs.

164. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Just for context, that is lower than the last two or three years, which was lower than most of the years before.

165. MS HOBSBAUM: I appreciate that.

166. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: No, it's not an argument. Just trying to, for those who are picking up.

167. MS HOBSBAUM: Yes. More than three quarters of cyclists' deaths over the last seven years involving HGVs have taken place at junctions. And 40% of them have taken place at traffic lights. So, putting HGVs and cyclists on the same roads without providing protected, separated space for cyclists is a recipe for disaster, as the CCTC warned you in its submission to the Select Committee on 26 November. Next slide

please?

168. We're really pleased to see the assurances that HS2 has already given to Camden, and we hope that HS2 will be a model of best practice in the freight construction industry. I'd like to remind the Committee that the Thames Tideway project has declared its intention to use what are called 'low-entry, high-visibility' or direct vision lorries such as you will see illustrated here. I believe that tipper lorries, such as are used for construction, have particularly poor outward vision, even when they're compared to conventional high cab lorries. And London Cycling Campaign is so concerned about the risk to cyclists posed by HGVs that it's currently campaigning to keep HGVs off the roads in rush hour to try to reduce interactions between lorries and cyclists. If that came in, it would clearly affect HS2's schedules. HS2 has the opportunity here to be a kind of construction industry logistics champion. However, we're quite concerned about the last two bullet points on this slide and I'll talk about those in particular. Next slide please?

169. This slide shows what protected cycle lanes look like. They're a curb between the cycle lane and the main traffic. And as you can see London Cycling Campaign has a policy about when such separation or protection is needed.

170. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: There is now, of course, a growing trend of abolishing curbs

171. MS HOBBSBAUM: Well, if you mean by that, substituting them with armadillos or wands or some other light segregation, I'm less concerned about that. What I'm really concerned about is that advisory or even mandatory paint on the road doesn't protect anybody. And paint on the road does not keep motor vehicles away from vulnerable road users. And ASLs, which are those green boxes with a cycle logo in them, before traffic lights really are not protective because if you as a cyclist don't get into the ASL while the lights are red, you have no more protection. So, you are likely to be left-hooked by any lorry turning. And lorries, left-hooks are a real problem because lorries have such poor visibility on the near side, unless they are direct vision lorries which have long –

172. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: We've had a good session on that.

173. MS HOBBSBAUM: You've seen those. Yes. Because Hampstead Road has in excess of 30,000 vehicles a day, protected cycle routes of some kind, not just paint on the road, really are needed. I appreciate that installing protection takes additional road carriageway space and I don't think it's our place here to go in for detailed road design, but given the sorts of vehicles on that road we would really want some protection. Where other roads, Albany Street would be a good example, where other roads aren't wide enough to offer protection, it's important to provide good satisfactory alternative routes for cyclists. Could we have the next slide please?

174. 'Quiet ways' is the term introduced in the Mayor's vision for cycling in 2013. While superhighways are supposed to be fast routes on busy roads for cyclists in a hurry, quiet ways are direct, continuous, quieter routes on side streets for new cyclists, cautious cyclists and all sorts of other people who'd rather take it more slowly. We appreciate that HS2 has tried to avoid Quiet ways, except where these are routes to satellite compounds or to and from construction sites. And that in many cases, the numbers of HGVs daily might be comparatively low. But there seem to be some roads, and we've listed them here, that you shouldn't need to use at all. Camden Council also asked that construction movements made by road and traffic diversions, HS2 should maximise TLRM and SRM routes. Arlington Road's been mentioned in a number of petitions as one where the residents use it a lot for cycling and it would be a good idea if HGVs could be kept off it. Could we have the next slide please?

175. I'd like to say that I'm really grateful that HS2 has recognised that it is going to be blocking some cycle routes and it has to offer some alternatives. Unfortunately, some of the alternatives which it has offered, it only seems to think that it's the distance that matters. So, for example, it says things like: 'Going down Hampstead Road will only send you on another 200m or 400m'. Whoopee. But, actually the alternative which you offer us takes us round some very risky roads. Some of the alternatives which have been offered are quite unsatisfactory, not to say dangerous.

176. The second point is that sharing space with pedestrians isn't very comfortable for either kinds of users. In particular, sharing space with pedestrians, particularly narrow spaces at going to school and coming home time where mothers have got buggies, where children are on scooters, everybody just gets very hassled and uncomfortable. And we would urge HS2 to find ways of segregating space for pedestrians and cyclists.



Next slide please?

177. This map shows what we consider to be the main cycle routes which are affected by HS2. You will see that there are two north south routes which merge down the bottom, along Hampstead Road. Yes. There. Brilliant. There's the Kilburn-Primrose Hill route, which then can go either east west or come down south. There are three east west routes: east west 1; east west 2; and east west 3. You'll see that some of these are kind of, they tail away. They're not complete routes. And CS11 is the cycle superhighway which we hope, god willing, weather permitting, will come down through Regent's Park and exit through Park Square east and west.

178. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: On west as well, east as well?

179. MS HOBSBAUM: Yes. It'll probably go all the way around. Because some cyclists may not come down cycle superhighway from the north. They may come in from Gloucester Gate. It may not be very easy or obvious to see from this map, but these routes bypass the main routes, by and large, the main roads. They avoid Euston Road. They come south of Euston Road at the bottom. They avoid Camden High Street. They only take in a little bit of Hampstead Road. The advantage of these routes is that by and large they don't force cyclists to use the main road. Next slide please?

180. I'm going to deal a bit with some of the issues about routes which are blocked. That blue route, the grid north south route 1 and 2, before HS2 blocked it, provided a good, satisfactory, quiet route across Euston Road down into Gordon Street. This is an example of where HS2's alternative seems to me to offer cyclists with a death wish an easy get-out. HS2 says: 'Come down the red road, whiz around Euston Circus'. That's three lanes of motor vehicles with no protection for cyclists. 'And you can either go along Euston Road there,' on an orange route, which is actually a bus route – that won't help you because you'll still have somehow to cross Euston Road to get down. Okay. We would prefer, given that many – 2,000 cyclists a day are crossing Euston Road and an awful lot of them use that Melton Street route. We'd prefer you to find a way to come down North Gower Street and across Euston Road into Gower Street. If you take the next slide, that shows you an aerial view of this? This was also suggested, I think, in the Euston Action Group's ask.

181. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Is this asking for greater separation or?

182. MS HOBSBAUM: Oh, absolutely. It would be lovely to have separate, well. I'm not asking for a flyover unless want to recommend a flyover. I don't think a flyover will work and I'll explain why. As part of the West End project, which hasn't yet hit the ground but will next year, Camden and TfL are going to re-model both Tottenham Court Road which is to the west of this picture and Gower Street. And Gower Street is going to have protected cycle tracks. They'll be raised tracks either side of the road. They won't be wonderful but they will be the best thing we've got in that area. Given that there will be protected cycle tracks coming up Gower Street, the obvious thing to do –

183. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: That will be two-way, will it?

184. MS HOBSBAUM: Yes. One going northbound. One going southbound. Opposite sides of the road. The obvious thing to do would be to continue them up to North Gower Street, up there. at the moment, there's a barrier which separates the two lanes of traffic going east west along Euston Road.

185. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: A central elevation –

186. MS HOBSBAUM: A central – yes, sorry. Thank you.

187. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: A barrier.

188. MS HOBSBAUM: It's called a central reservation. That's what keeps the dual carriageway traffic apart. I understand that TfL also ask for a crossing here and HS2 has been doing some investigation about this and we understand that there are technical difficulties. I don't know whether those are insuperable or simply expensive. But it's the obvious place to make a safe crossing of Euston Road.

189. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: If it's not grade separated, you've got traffic lights both east and west of there, and the question is whether you can keep the capacity and build, hold the traffic at the cycle crossing.

190. MS HOBSBAUM: Yes, on the other hand, the –

191. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: My guess is it's actually wide enough to be able to use the full capacity when the lights change.

192. MS HOBSBAUM: I'm not a traffic engineer. I would hope. I realise, on the

other hand, the Melton Street intersection goes. And there is going to be in Spring of 2016, TfL consulting about a lot of these junctions along Euston Road. I just think that to keep cyclists away from the junction with Tottenham Court Road/Euston Circus – Euston Circus sounds such a nice – Circus! – nice kind of thing.

193. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: It's more a chaos than a circus.

194. MS HOBSBAUM: It's more a chaos than a circus. Yes. Absolutely. Yes. We would like to propose that HS2 should consider and encourage was to make that crossing feasible. Next slide please?

195. We've talked about north south permeability. Now, we're going to talk about east west permeability. We're not the only people concerned about this. TfL was also concerned to make sure that there was some way that pedestrians and cyclists could go across from Hampstead Road as right across to the other side of Euston. It's going to be a very busy route for pedestrians and cyclists. And given the way that HS2 is otherwise blocking a number of those east west routes, there isn't an easy way to get across to the Kings Cross Lands, to Google, to the new Kings Cross, St Patrick's Stations, the Crick Institute, all the places on the east side of Euston, which will have a big footfall.

196. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Something equivalent to the cycle bridge at Cambridge, where it goes across some of the railway lines.

197. MS HOBSBAUM: Yes. Would be lovely. We note that HS2 has now said that, in its response to TfL, that a bridge, a bridge at the north end of Euston Station, might be considered but in its response it's now call the Parcel Deck Study. There's a Parcel Deck there?

198. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Yes.

199. MS HOBSBAUM: I didn't know. I've never been privileged to go on it. but in the letter to TfL it's referred to as a pedestrian bridge. I just want to put down a marker that it should be a pedestrian and cycle bridge please. Next slide please.

200. Okay. Just a pretty picture of the Outer Circle, to remind people how lovely it is to cycle around there. I did think that if Sir Cameron McIntosh got a bike he could get down to the office from Park Village West in 20 minutes with absolutely, guaranteed,

no traffic jams. We now understand from a really helpful meeting that we had with HS2 on Friday afternoon that actually they're only going to be using a bit of the Outer Circle during the construction of the lorry holding area. Good. If you can get out of the Outer Circle as quickly as possible that would be wonderful because actually HGVs aren't allowed in the Outer Circle anyway.

201. We also understand that HS2 has given, now, an assurance to TfL that the HGV holding area down on Park Crescent East is going to be reconsidered. I've no idea what alternative site they will find. Not our problem. Just keep it off the cycle superhighway, please. Next slide please?

202. I'm sorry. I'm going to talk about Hampstead Road. I know you've heard about Hampstead Road a lot. We're not worried about the height of it, you'll be pleased to know. We appreciate that Hampstead Road Bridge is going to be constructed in two phases. We're not quite sure how long each of those phases will take but that doesn't actually matter. During the first stage they do away with the bus lane which could be shared with cyclists and put paint on the road. Leaving aside the dangers on such a busy road, we'd like to point out that it's going to be very difficult for cyclists coming out of Mornington Crescent or any of these roads to get across and to go south. There are no traffic signals indicating, there's nothing indicating, how they go south down Hampstead Road. If you go on to the next slide? Going further down Hampstead Road – on slide 17 – as you come whizzing down Hampstead Road, and you get to the junction with Robert Street, here, you've got an ASL, some kind of pedestrian reservation to protect the peds. Fine. Lovely. But, advisory cycle lanes and an ASL, at a junction like that –

203. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Advance Stop Light, for those wondering.

204. MS HOBSBAUM: Yes. Advance Stop Lights. Green paint on the road, too many cyclists, too big a daily motor flow. Absolutely not acceptable. There will be cyclists going north and south and we really don't want anybody to be left-hooked here. That's going to be a junction going in to Euston. It would be a place where left-hooks at all costs need to be avoided. You need a safe junction design there.

205. Okay. Next stage. Right. By now, that side, the previous side of Hampstead Road has been demolished while this lovely new side has been constructed. And now

offers cyclists a bi-directional track on the west side of the road between Robert Street, in the south, and Mornington Crescent in the north. You have cyclists apparently with a protected curb between them. Hurrah, hurrah. So, we have protection but we're coming up or down the wrong side of the road. If you were coming out of Lidlington Place, how would you get across the two lines of traffic to get on that road to go south? If you were coming north, what stops you getting left-hooked by things going into Granby Terrace? Or coming out of Granby Terrace? It's a construction vehicle site. Suppose you're like me and you just want to go straight up, this curb needs to be broken so that I can go up Hampstead Road. A lot of these junctions don't seem to have been thought out satisfactorily. Could we have the next slide please?

206. This is the one where you need the most imagination. Bi-directional track, coming down Hampstead Road, the bi-directional track stops here at Roberts Street and cyclists somehow make an interesting diagonal to get on to the usual side of the road to continue south. That junction needs to be a protected junction with a cyclists' only phase of traffic lights so that cyclists can make that crossing safely without any motor traffic in the way. Some cyclists may be coming out of Roberts Street and will also need to make that. So, we need careful thought about those detailed designs.

207. Okay. I think we could skip the next three and go on to slide 23. They're in there just to illustrate the need that all the junctions and routes for cyclists have to be carefully thought out.

208. This is when you get to at the end of all the work, you get to Euston Station. The HS2 seems to suggest a shared cycle / pedestrian route to reach the public space down there. and again if you weren't going to stop at Euston Station, if you were going past, HS2 pushes you on to Hampstead Road, which I've indicated isn't a good way, isn't going to be a good route for cyclists, and for that kind of reason we would say North Gower Street would get cyclists past the station in a much more effective and safe way. Okay. Slide 24 please?

209. HS2 suggests that you'll need cycle parking for 2,000 cycles at Euston. The new Waterloo Station has 5,000 envisaged. I can't see why Euston is likely to need any fewer cycle parking spaces. And in fact I think that by 2033, you might be looking at 10,000 cycle parking spaces. I know I've never seen a cycle parking space for 10,000

bikes but stations in Holland have lots of them. So, TfL thought that it would be sensible to have one big hub with ample facilities, maybe even showers for sweaty cyclists, who knows. With maintenance staff, bike mechanics, all of that kind of thing. And I think that it would be wonderful if HS2 could provide adequate cycle parking because so far I don't think there is a single London terminus that has enough cycle parks for cyclists.

210. We're nearly there, folks. The next slide. One of the things which we learnt during the construction of the Chanel Tunnel Rail Link was that all the roads going down that way were protected by an Act of Parliament and Camden had no jurisdiction and could do nothing to cycle proof those roads. Now, seven years after the opening of the new St Pancras International, Camden is still working to try to improve the conditions on those roads for cyclists. I think the moral of that story is that we need to be working proactively and involved from the beginning. And in both our petitions we've asked to be consulted directly on detailed plans but in both cases the promoter's response document advises us that the provision will be discussed with TfL and Camden. Now, in fact, there are particular reasons why I think that London Cycling Campaign should be included in negotiations during the detailed design stage. TfL recently issued the London Cycle Design Standards, there a whole lot of specific issues about cycling in lots of traffic in London that would make London Cycling Campaign's contribution to those negotiations really helpful. Slide 26?

211. We do appreciate that HS2 has given assurances to TfL and Camden and where those overlap with our requests on HGV safety, on the Parcel Deck Bridge study, on further investigations of the crossing of Euston Road at Gower Street, we're really grateful and appreciative. But, we would like to request that London Cycling Campaign should be included in the detailed design stage now rather than leaving it until too late. Thank you.

212. CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. Mr Strachan?

213. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Thank you. Can I answer some of these requests just by showing you the extent to which we have already incorporated, I hope, as you'll see, a considerable amount of what the petitioners are seeking by way of the involvement of careful design to do with cyclists' safety? Can I just show you the

Camden assurances, please? There are a number of assurances that are of relevance to the petitioner. And if we could please go to clause 6.4 of that document? It begins at – P11427(15). Thank you. There are a number of detailed assurances which relate to cycling and cycle safety. So, they're not necessarily in the order that they've been raised but just to give you an idea of where they are. Clause 6.4 deals with construction routes used by pedestrians and cyclists and here: 'Where reasonably practicable, we will retain access for pedestrians and cyclists where safe and appropriate to do so, including where any highways closed to traffic under the powers of the Bill'. And then site specific measures will be discussed with the highway authorities and the emergency services. Then, if I could take you then to Clause 6.9? you'll see that we, as part of our Transport Management Plans, will agree a list of roads that can and cannot be used for construction traffic which I know is of interest to the petitioners, bearing in mind the points they have just identified about restricting some roads as being unsuitable for construction traffic, bearing in mind their proposed use for not just cyclists but other pedestrian users, as well.

214. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Those sorts of things, do they have to tag along with London Borough of Camden and Transport for London or will the London Cycling Campaign and the Camden Cycling Campaign be directly involved, being heard, consulted before decisions are made?

215. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Well, these assurances are directly applied to Camden. But, in terms of involvement in the process, I've referred you to the involvement generally in the process for Euston Station design and the public participation which of course will be open to the London Cycling Campaign. I was going to take you to another assurance which the Committee has heard about earlier on in this process which was given to the Cyclists' Touring Club, which I'll come back to in a moment because to the extent that – we can see the extent to which that involves the Cyclists' Touring Club – but the extent to which the London Cycling Campaign might also have things to add to Cyclists' Touring Club, I'll show you in a minute the process of engagement with that organisation. But, if I just finish with the assurances here. We then have 6.10, which is one of the most pertinent provisions. The Secretary of State is requiring the nominees' undertaker to comply as far as reasonably practicable with the CLOCS scheme, that's the Construction Logistics and Cyclists Safety, as well as the

first operator recognition system or such equivalent or better standards or systems that may replace them. So, it's intended to be an assurance which picks up any improvements to these measures that may occur in the future. The 'reasonably practicable' proviso is explained in the page which is at the bottom there. it continues: The assurance includes that proviso as we consider there are two areas where further works required to ensure that the CLOCS standard can be fully applied in Camden. And the first relates to driver training, where the amount of training capacity which will be available is not yet known. But, that's currently being discussed with the CLOCS working group. And then the second is in the use of the sideguards because CLOCS makes provision for the use of sideguards. We are proposing a higher standard than the CLOCS standard as part of our proposal and therefore we're seeking to recognise that in this assurance. There are issues about sideguards for use in existing vehicles as compared with new vehicles and, again, you heard about that in relation to the Cyclists' Touring Club when they came in. I'll come back to that in a moment.

216. Those are three specific assurances given to Camden. There is also a TfL assurance in their assurance letter. I don't know if you can get it on the screen. P12500(17). But, whilst it's coming up, whilst we're finding it on the system, those are two TfL specific assurances at paragraphs 8.4 and 8.5. as part of the Code of Construction Practice, through the HS2 planning forum there'll be further provisions considered to consider the safety of vulnerable road users, which would of course include cyclists. And under 8.5: 'Will require the nominated undertake to ensure that the Code of Construction Practice and other environmental controls in B1 will reflect best practices from other major infrastructure projects, including, in London, any guidance issued by the Mayor'. So, again, were seeking to incorporate best practice for the protection of, amongst others, cyclists. There are a range of assurances already which are there, specifically designed to deal with safety of cyclists, encouraging to continue cyclists to use the roads whilst construction is going on, identifying appropriate roads, and ensuring the necessary safety measures, consistent with the CLOCS best practice, are incorporated and those sit alongside the local transport management plans that will have to be agreed. Can I just turn to the specific measures that were talked about? There's an over-arching answer to a lot of these which is that in the construction phase, I've already shown you the assurances which will mean that the cyclists' routes and junctions with construction traffic where we're putting them in will be designed to



be safe for cyclists. And the second point is that in the detailed design of the junctions that we're proposing, there will have to be proper consideration of the points that have been raised by the petitioner to ensure the safe operation of the cycle routes. And I know a number of detailed points have been made about, for example, segregated cycleways where there needs to be a break. And those sorts of things, we anticipate will be the subject of the detailed design of those junctions in conjunction with the highway authority and TfL. I'll come to the cyclists' Touring Club points in a moment.

217. In fact, why don't I just show it to you now because this picks up on some of the provision at Euston Station itself. If we can get up on screen the assurance that was provided to the Cyclists' Touring Club? I think you heard about this a few weeks ago. This was in response to the Cyclists' Touring Club who were raising route wide issues rather than simply those in Camden. But you'll see a lot of them are applicable to Camden.

218. The first was to use reasonable endeavours to ensure that during the detailed design of HS2, the Cycle Rail Working Group, and there is such a Working Group, will engage with the Cyclists' Touring Club prior to any occasion when HS2 associated issues are to be discussed during meetings of that group. And if the request is for consultations only with the Camden Cycling –

219. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Camden Cycling Campaign as part of the London Cycling Campaign.

220. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): As part of the London Cycling Campaign. I will find out whether that can be done. That would, in essence, mirror what's been done for the Cyclists' Touring Club.

221. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: I think it's possible to have an equivalent or adapted letter which does go to the LCC/CCC.

222. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I understand. I will take that request away and see if that can be achieved.

223. The second detailed assurance is relating the Cycle / Rail Working Group are all about cycle / rail integration in phase 1 of HS2. And you'll see there that includes the

issues that you've raised relating to cycle proofing the station and agreeing terms of reference for the cycle proof Working Group and you'll see it 2C, cycle facilities at stations developed as phase 1 of HS2. That includes not just Euston of course, but the other end of the line. And then in that engagement process, you'll see there's a reference framework, various cycle / rail tool kits, station development guidelines and station development companion guidelines. And as part of that exercise to work out the optimum facilities for cyclists as part of the overall station design. And you can see that continues in paragraph 4 of the same. If you just pull down? We have to engage with the Cycle Proofing Working Group during the detailed design and that's not limited to cycle proofing of highways permanently constructed or altered as part of the phase 1 construction works.

224. That really is an answer in a general sense to many of the requests that have been made about the specific design of roads and junctions where we alter them in consequence of the HS2 station. I don't want to spend in those circumstances too long on the specific requests but I just want to cover one which was the suggestion of a junction. It's on slide A1751(13), north south permeability, and that was a cycle route via North Gower Street. We just put A1751(13) back up on the screen. The answer to that currently is that TfL did itself look at the potential of providing a cycle route across the Euston Road in that location. We can get it back up on screen in a moment. but there wasn't a technical solution that was feasible to achieve that. And part of the problem, as you can see, and you probably know the road, but there's an underpass which is in the middle of the road. I'll just move my arrow that way. Going that way. East west which is coming up. Joining the traffic here. And as I understand it, TfL have already looked at the feasibility of providing some sort of junction and concluded it wasn't possible. It's something that we are aware of and we are aware of TfL's current views on it. That said, of course, one of the other measures of the proposed measures is the cycle superhighway on the outer circle which comes to the west. It's an additional north south –

225. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Indeed it is, but then.

226. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): – cycle superhighway, when –

227. MS HOBBSBAUM: It won't help students going into Bloomsbury, will it? Going

straight down to UCL.

228. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Well, it will –

229. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: We understand what's happening on the north south superhighway to the west of Euston. At the present, you can come down Melton Street pretty safely, come across a light controlled crossing of Euston Road. If that shifted from Melton Street, you're not going to shift to Regent's Park. They will shift to North Gower Street. And the question then is: what is going to be the way of getting across the Euston Road? Now, we know the difficulties. And we know that a solution hasn't been found yet. What they're asking for, and what this Committee would be pretty keen to support them on, is more work to find the safest possible way of crossing Euston Road somewhere in the vicinity of North Gower Street, that doesn't require more than about a 20-yard diversion. That's the task.

230. CHAIR: Have you got to the end Mr Strachan?

231. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): The other link that was talked about is the northern part of the throat where you recall is an assurance to look at an east west link which is currently identified for pedestrians but I assume, and I will check, that there's no potential problem with looking at that in the context of cycling as well because it's a pedestrian link that would be considered as part of that study which is the assurance that has been given. I will find out that.

232. CHAIR: Okay.

233. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Including a study in relation to cycling. And the other more detailed design requests will be picked up on as part of that general assurance that I've already referred to in terms of the detailed design of the construction routes. I will take away the point about the London Cycling Campaign being subject to the assurance and of course this particular request of a link across the Euston Road.

234. CHAIR: Thank you. Brief final comments.

235. MS HOBSBAUM: Just say, I'm really reassured by all those things. Crossrail construction vehicles have already managed to kill two cyclists. And I would hope that HS2 isn't going to have a similar kind of reputation. It seems to me HS2 could be a real

champion for that. It could be fantastic. And it's good to hear so many assurances about it. the Code of Construction Practice refers to highway and traffic authorities 'and other relevant key stakeholders' and I just think London Cycling Campaign is exactly that kind of relevant, key stakeholder. Thank you.

236. CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. We now move on to 931 Simon and Diana Pearson.

### **Simon and Diana Pearson**

237. CHAIR: Welcome. I know you've been here from the very beginning and I hope you're as anxious to make progress as we are.

238. MR PEARSON: Yes.

239. MRS PEARSON: We certainly are.

240. MR PEARSON: I'm Simon Pearson. This is Diana. In case it wasn't already obvious. Our original petition there were 15 points made. And the promoter initially responded to 13 of them. We pointed out that two points had no responses and the promoter has now responded to those points. Now, that the HS1 to HS2 link has been abandoned, our home in Kentish Town is not particularly affected and some of the points are no longer of concern. Other points have been made more expertly by other petitioners. And we will not dwell on them. In our petition, paragraph 10 concerns cycle routes which we regularly use which were to become lorry routes. Those which remain lorry routes have been raised by Camden Council and TfL and just now by Camden Cyclists and we're content with that. Our paragraph 11 concerned the effects on our church, which is St Xavier's Eton Road, Hampstead, which is quite close to the vent shaft, proposed vent shaft, in Adelaide Road. While Eton Road is no longer a lorry route we remain concerned that it will become a rat run for traffic avoiding congestion near the Adelaide Road vent shaft site, particularly when Adelaide Road is closed. The church is used seven days a week and we will be affected by noise and vibration. Yes, we're looking at three and four, as well, please.

241. You can see these are taken, these two views, are taken roughly from the Adelaide Road vent site so we are quite close to it. And incidentally, there's also a synagogue in

the same street. We therefore ask the Committee to ask HS2 to investigate thoroughly the alternative vent shaft site off Regent's Park Road which we understand will be proposed by Gloucester Avenue Association. Also, to ask Camden Council to restrict Eton Road to access only. These requests also cover requests made in paragraphs 12 and 24 of that petition. Paragraph 13 concerns the lack of alternative green space close to Euston Square and St James's Gardens. Can we look at five? Yes. Thanks.

242. We dispute the promoter's response that Gordon Square, Tavistock Square and Regent's Park are acceptable alternatives. They are not nearby in terms of distance or walking time and traffic. So we ask the Committee to direct HS2 to liaise with Camden Council on this point. And this was also made in Camden's submission. Our paragraph 14 concerned poor air quality and we support all the points made by Camden TfL and others. We'll come to paragraphs 15 and 16 which were the ones, two, not initially responded to. We'll come to those at the end.

243. Paragraph 17, and could we look at slide 7, paragraph 17 concerns disruption to bus journeys. And we support the points made by Camden and TfL. Routes 24, 27, 29, 88, 134, all use Hampstead Road dedicated bus lanes. If you look at slide 8? Dedicated bus lanes. And those bus lanes, to my understanding, will be removed during construction. And if you look at 9, please? You see there, there are dedicated bus lanes only for buses, taxis, cyclists. We're concerned that they will be removed during construction. On bus routes, additionally routes 31, 168 and 393 would be disrupted in the Chalk Farm / Adelaide Road area due to the vent shaft that we've previously talked about. Our family use all these routes and we would ask the Committee to order additional bus priority measures. And we note that Camden Road is still a construction traffic route and our son uses the route 29, 253 and 393 frequently so we'd be concerned if Camden Road was seriously disrupted by construction traffic. Slide 10 please.

244. Paragraph 18 concerns disruption to journeys to University College Hospital and ambulance response times raised by others. We suggest the promoter's response that emergency vehicles can turn on their blue lights is not an adequate response. In any case, many individual emergency journeys are made by private transport: taxis etc. We'd be concerned they'd be held up in congestion on Hampstead Road.

245. Paragraphs 19 and 20 have been satisfied with the removal of the links to HS1. Paragraphs 21 and 22 concern the design and construction of Euston Station and use of rail for deliveries and disposals. And we're content for Camden Council, TfL and others to deal with these.

246. Number 11, which is on the screen. Paragraph 23 concerns the proposal to terminate trains at Old Oak Common temporarily or permanently already made by others and we're content for others to deal with this. We would however comment on the submission to the Committee that was made by the MP for Holborn and St Pancras, Keir Starmer, back on 8 July this year. And specifically, the replies to his submission by HS2 counsel Timothy Mould. Mr Mould commented that the quality of travel experience would be inferior if terminated at Old Oak Common. And he then went on to give estimated travel times to Kings Cross and Waterloo from there, Old Oak Common. As you can see, we suggest that during the construction period, the quality and time of travel to these stations from Euston itself would be considerably worse than Mr Mould quoted for an Old Oak Common terminus, especially at times of minor disruption, such as the picture shows.

247. Now, we come to the paragraphs 15 and 16. Our family's privileged to own a second home in mid Wales and we spend all our holidays and short breaks there. And we always travel by train from Euston, generally changing at Birmingham New Street in Shrewsbury. Unfortunately, we won't be able to use HS2 for these journeys as it will involve a walk across Birmingham with luggage from Curzon Street to New Street. And as we will be in our seventies when HS2 phase 1 commences, is ready for use, and our son is disabled, we're not prepared to do that. Now, a transfer between Birmingham Interchange Station and Birmingham International would be equally difficult and impractical. The total journey time would be longer, as connecting time would be more uncertain, especially if many other passengers were making the same connection at the same time. HS2, itself estimates that only 50% of existing passengers would transfer to HS2. If we could quickly look at 13? This was the response that we got, 13, 14, was the response we go to paragraphs 15 and 16. The response is highly technical but generally disclaims all responsibility for non-HS2 service provision. We've looked at the explanation of the service patterns in the updated case for HS2 which is dated August 2012 and it was published in January 2013. I think that's on –

248. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: We've gone through this at least three times.

249. MR PEARSON: Have you?

250. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: In quite some detail with people who design railways and others so I think you shouldn't trouble yourself too much with the service pattern because you're really supposed to be here how you're directly affected and you've told us you aren't going to be using it so you're not –

251. MR PEARSON: Well, they propose two column groups. A do minimum group and a do something group. The do something group, of service patterns, could we look at 18? The do something group of those factors generally inferior in terms of the number of trains. The do minimum group, we assume is based on the current service patterns operated by Virgin Trains, which shows on slide 17 under their West Coast franchise. We request the Committee to instruct HS2 to work with the ORR and the train operator, at the time, to maintain the current service pattern and timing of 125 mile an hour trains as a minimum from Euston to New Street and Wolverhampton and for those trains which call at Crewe. We realise that during the construction of phase 2, which I know you haven't come to yet, that the current platforms 13 to 18 at Euston, 13 to 18 inclusive, will be out of use and we request that sufficient timetabling capacity is made available in the then newly commissioned platforms, presumably numbered 19 to 22, for the classic West Coast train service that's been described here. So, that is how the Committee could help our family and we thank you for hearing us.

252. CHAIR: Thank you very much for being brief. We'll reflect on your comments. You seem to have had a good response for most of your points. Some of the other points you've raised, we've already had quite detailed explanations from the promoter and we will reflect on some of the further comments that you made before we do our report. So, thank you very much indeed for those.

253. MR PEARSON: Thank you.

254. CHAIR: Thank you.

255. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): There was no response.

256. CHAIR: No, we've had a response to most of the points.

257. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Okay.

258. CHAIR: We now move to 977, 317, 1683 and 1044 represented by Peter Lyons.

**The Castlehaven Community Association and others**

259. CHAIR: You're going to have to move to your right a little bit, otherwise you'll be off camera. Thank you very much indeed. Who's going to kick off then?

260. MS BOTWRIGHT: I'll start. My name is Eleanor Botwright. I'm speaking on behalf of the Castlehaven Community Association which manages the service delivered to the local community from the Castlehaven site which is on Castlehaven Road on the main traffic flow. We deliver services to some of the most vulnerable members of our community, in particular children and young people and the very elderly. We work with approximately 1,000 older people a year, access our services, most of whom struggle with mobility but are capable of getting around. So I was particularly interested in the points that were made about the bus services that are likely to be discontinued during the construction period. We've already seen an impact on some of the work with our older people just by one bus stop in the Chalk Farm Road being closed at the moment due to some construction work. So, there are often unintended consequences as a direct result of some of the work that's being done. We have got a list of requests or asks and I will go through those and then my colleagues here will explain in more detail why we've asked these particular requests.

261. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: How many are there?

262. MS BOTWRIGHT: Four. We ask that the Select Committee recognise that HS2's proposed methods of construction will add further deaths attributable to increased air pollution which is already violating EU air quality standards. We believe that HS2 needs to have a budget available for expenditure to mitigate any operation which might put the general public at risk. We also ask you to require that a framework is established to determine the levels of expenditure HS2 must incur to mitigate these attributable deaths. There are frameworks already in use by rail operators which may be suitable. We ask for a place on groups established to implement and or monitor the movement of spoil. And we request an air quality monitoring stations be located in our areas, particularly on the Castlehaven open space to monitor NO2 and P2.5 micro-



particulates which are particularly harmful.

263. MS GEMMELL: Can we have our slides up? It's A1752. My name's Kathryn Gemmell and I'm representing the North Camden Town Neighbourhood Forum Steering Group. Have you got the slides? We're also representing Harmond Street and also the Geoffrey's Street Association. Can you go on to slide 3, please?

264. So we're particularly worried about the quality of air around our area. It is already exceeding acceptable EU levels. And in particular this affects children and the elderly in our area. And we just want to draw your attention to the fact that the construction methods put forward by HS2 will in fact add to our air pollution in our neighbourhood. Camden is one of the worst affected areas in London, not the only one, but one of the very worst affected. Those numbers there are specific to the whole area of Camden. Slide 4 please? From two academic papers, Public Health England and King's College, we have estimated ourselves that there will be 52 attributable deaths due to the air pollution in our local area, or Camden Town and Primrose Hill, as current air pollution stands. That also includes a loss of 900 life years. So, people will live less years. Slide 5, please? These are the academic studies that we have used to calculate. And in the red box below, that's specifically our area of Camden Town and Primrose Hill. This study includes carbon dioxide and also P2 5 particulates. Slide 6, please? With the initial construction plans the diagram on that shows the initial plan for construction traffic specifically around our area. According to HS2 they will add a further 10% to the already 23% in excess of EU regulations that we have in this area. This will also lead to a further 17 attributable deaths. That is with the 10% increase based on the initial construction plans of HS2. The promoter's response was that the proposed scheme's contribution to roadside NO2 concentrations was both temporary and relatively small. But this this not temporary or small to elderly people in our community in our area who already have lung conditions or medical conditions and in fact could be terminal. Slide 7, please. Slide 7 again shows you around our area of Camden Town. The blue dots represent schools, childcare facilities and nurseries in our area. And we estimate in excess of 7,000 children within this area. Many of them actually on some of the construction routes, even the new, lessened construction routes that have been proposed. My daughter goes to a school in Camden Road and has just started there. She has five or six years on that construction route.

265. MR LYONS: Yes. If we could move to the next slide? There's a series of three slides here which try to show the incrementalism that is applied to the succession of the promoter's schemes looked at from the air quality point of view. The first map is based on the initial scheme that was the subject of the Hybrid Bill. You can see the main routes. The red circles are the loci of the various petitioners here. You can see that each of the pink or darker squares represents levels of NO<sub>2</sub> which are in excess of EU standards. The averages we've mentioned before. If you average all the sites given in the data by HS2, you come to 23% for NO<sub>2</sub> in excess of EU standards and an additional 10%. That translates into 17 fatalities which are attributable to air quality.

266. The next slides shows an incrementally improved position, because of course the HS1-HS2 link has been deleted and we're all very keen that that should remain out of consideration. But nevertheless, there's still quite a bit of construction traffic. The red dots are taken from HS2's own publications which shows the area of significant impact from air pollution.

267. The next slide deals with the issue of Euro 6 HGV's as a mitigation. Is that an adequate mitigation? Well, the fact is that we already live in an area which is in excess of the tolerable limits. So any action, any construction method which adds further to that has to be really questionable. It may not increase as much as it would do if unspecified vehicles were used, but, nevertheless, it represents an additional burden as a result of the methods of work.

268. The next slide just refers to the position that you're all familiar with on the safety of railway operations. Where the public is exposed to risk – that may be through incidents like Southall where there are train collisions or Potters Bar where the maintenance isn't done properly or collisions at level crossings, there is a well-established framework for explaining how much should be invested to mitigate a fatality. If that were to be applied, we would move to the risk picture which is shown in the next slide.

269. This is a summary of the health and safety executive's approach. It considers there to be three areas: an area where risk is broadly acceptable, that is, the green area on the triangle; an area at the top, which is intolerable; and an area which is called the ALARP region, 'as low as reasonable practicable', where you would look for the

promoter to introduce reasonable means which mitigate the risk. On the calculations I've done here, I'm suggesting they're done properly as part of the formal assessment by HS2, the risk, represented by the air quality, is intolerable.

270. If you try to translate this into risk that are common every day risks on the next slide – this is taking a slide from NHS Scotland – you can see that driving a car is recognised to be a significant risk, but it is regulated to make it as low as reasonably practicable. But smoking in public is considered intolerable. There's legislation to prevent it.

271. So we are taking the point of view that for infrastructure projects which add to an already intolerable risk situation, there should be a sum of money allocated in the budget to mitigate the risk.

272. On the next slide you'll see some rough calculations which ought to be gone through, properly presented, indicating that a budget allocation just for the risks attributable to Camden Town and Primrose Hill is something in the order of 30 million.

273. On the final slide we suggest how that money is spent. We understand that assurances have been given by HS2 that studies will look into maximising the use of rail to remove demolition spoil and introduce materials. We're suggesting that that budget should be specifically used to buy train paths. There should be no leave at all for this incremental approach of adding additional HGV's to already crowded and overburdened spaces. The movement of material and removal of spoil should be entirely by rail. If that were to be done, there would be no impact for the train operator, they be compensated for the train paths, but the burden would be shared by the people who will eventually benefit from the improved service, those who travel on the train.

274. CHAIR: Yes?

275. MR LYONS: Thank you for listening to me.

276. CHAIR: Yes. Mr Strachan.

277. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes. There are a few issues raised. I can just deal, first of all, with bus services. We are not discontinuing bus services in the area that affects these petitioners. There is one bus diversion that occurs for a period of four

months when the Adelaide Road vent shaft is constructed and there has to be a temporary road closure of Adelaide Road, and there's a bus diversion around that particular closure. The other bus services are maintained, including those along, for example, Camden Road and Hampstead Road, through the process of construction I've previously described to you.

278. So far as the other issue is concerned, air pollution, air pollution assessment features very heavily in the environmental statement. There's detailed modelling of the effects, some of which the petitioners have referred to. The principle that is expressed and is now the subject of a specific assurance with Camden as the relevant environmental health organisation monitoring air quality in this area. P11428(1) is set out in paragraph 14. I know the Committee's already seen it, but just in case the petitioners have not, that requires us to manage air quality effects adjacent to the highways where a significant effect has been identified which is the areas where the petitioners were looking at. It identifies in this paragraph, in order to manage significant impacts related to highway traffic changes and interventions, we'll need to put place a management process to manage those impacts through measurement of air quality and regular assessments of the air quality situation.

279. Where significant effects are still predicted, action plans will be put in place with the objective of removing those significant effects, and that process is modelled on Defra's Local Air Quality and Management, which is set out under the relevant environment act.

280. The periodic reviews and action plans are envisaged as being similar to those produced in that process, and that comprises measure, review, action plan. That also will include base line air quality monitoring in locations where potential significant effects are predicted.

281. All of that is currently based upon reasonable worst case scenarios of modelling in the environmental statement. In practice, both measures taken to reduce traffic and further measures to reduce submissions were likely to lower those actual effects. But even in the absence of that, there are the specific assurance requiring us to deal with significant effects though management plans. That, of course, is part of – that mitigation forms part of the project costs and is part of the projects commitment which

will be met through the costs of the project and already planned as part of the environmental statement.

282. So that is the way in which we're dealing with air quality effects, managing those effects, in accordance with the methodology which was reflected in the Defra Local Air Quality and Management Approach.

283. CHAIR: Yes, we've been talking a lot about air quality. Clearly it's a big issue in Camden. Would you like to make some brief, final comments?

284. MS BOTWRIGHT: I would just like some comments about us being involved in whatever groups are established to implement the move of spoil.

285. CHAIR: Yes, brief, final – he's responded to your – you're not allowed to ask questions particularly of the promoter. He can respond if he wants, but –

286. MR LYONS: I think the key thing is this: yes, we understand measure and we've offered space to actually put a monitoring station on the CCA site. But what is actually the action plan going to be? If the construction method commits to the use of HGVs, that is going to increase what is already above a tolerable limit. The only credible action plan is to revert to rail, and we would like to see some evidence from HS2 that they are taking maximisation of the use of rail seriously.

287. CHAIR: We understand there's a study, but we have to produce a report at the end of the Committee which goes to the government about what we think they should do. We have taken on board this point.

288. MR LYONS: Okay. Thank you.

289. CHAIR: Not least because we've walked round all the streets, and it's not a great area to take lots of vehicles out of.

290. MR LYONS: Well, I think the issue of major infrastructure is on everybody's mind. You can't have a major infrastructure project – Heathrow, Third Runway, whatever – unless part of the design brief is an improvement in what are intolerable air quality issues. I see no reason why that applies to Heathrow 2 as to cause all sorts of reconsiderations shouldn't apply to HS2 as well, which is a major infrastructure project.

Should be improving the air quality in Camden, not adding further to its burden.

291. CHAIR: Point taken. Thanks for being punchy and brief. Thank you. Right, we now move to 324, AP3: 14 Camden Town Centre Limited, Simon Pitkeathley.

**Camden Town Centre Limited**

292. MR PITKEATHLEY: Thank you very much. My name is Simon Pitkeathley. I'm the Chief Executive of Camden Town Unlimited, Business Improvements District. With me –

293. MR SAGAR: Martin Sagar, vice chair of Camden Town Unlimited, and a partner in Sheppard Robson, one of the largest employers in the district, employing 350 people in Parkway, just off Camden High Street.

294. MR PITKEATHLEY: Thank you very much. I think we have three key points. First is an acknowledgement that the absence of a link is to be welcomed. We always say if you're going to do it, do it properly; if not, we think it. We think that the northern entrance to the station could do with further rethinking, acknowledging that some thought happens to Euston Station. More broadly, we believe that allowing network rail to keep the capital receipts for the redevelopment of a whole Euston site would produce significant benefits to this part of London, both the local, regional and national economy, and we believe that that regeneration activity should be thought of hand in hand with transport need rather than one above the other.

295. As I said, my name is Simon Pitkeathley. I'm the Chief Executive of Camden Town Unlimited, which is a business improvement district. We represent 300 member businesses. It's probably worth quickly noting that a business improvement district is elected into being by its member business every five years. By doing so, by electing us in that way, they are effectively volunteering to tax themselves to improve their areas. So we believe as a constituency they are interesting, they're certainly vibrant, and they are also, contrary to popular perception, much more dominated by creative industries – it's much more office based, creative industries sector, than it is a visitor economy. Not to say the visitor economy isn't large and important, but the creative industry sector is perhaps far more important to us than is first apparent. I'm also a proposer for a Euston Town Business Improvement District, which goes to ballot in February and we'd

obviously incorporate this area.

296. Can I have the next slide, please? In order to make the point about the northern entrance we thought it was worth just reflecting on Euston's original conception and build. So back in 1836 when it was built, you can see that it sits to the north of London. The dominant part of London, obviously, was to the south of the Euston Road. To the north, Camden Town is pretty rural. It made a lot of sense to site the station on the edge of that conurbation. Indeed, when the redevelopment or the rebuild happened in 1968, despite the urban spread that orientation was maintained.

297. Next slide, please. What we see now is that the station is in amongst a very vibrant area. If you look at the words 'Regent's Park' there there's a sort of crescent shape. That's Greater London House. There are 5,000 people a day going in and out of there. It includes ASOS –

298. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: We've got quite a lot of this in our minds from going around and just talking to people.

299. MR PITKEATHLEY: Excellent.

300. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Pretend we've got three weeks knowledge of Camden, please.

301. MR PITKEATHLEY: Okay. Understood. Well, I won't run through the broader points about the economy. But the point, I think, still stands that where once this was a station sitting on the edge of London it's now a station that sits in the middle of an important conurbation. If you look St Pancras, to the east, that too, in a sense, still faces south, despite the fact that it is increasingly part of that extended envelope of Central London. Our suggestion or contention is that instead of seeing a northern entrance as a nice addition to something that faces south, the whole concept should be rethought as something that is an open station that sits within an area. Next slide, please.

302. You'll have seen when you walk round, the station is pretty impermeable. Those are views from the west.

303. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: We've got a lot of this as well.

304. CHAIR: East, west, north and south.

305. MR PITKEATHLEY: Excellent. So permeability crosses all areas. Next slide, please. What we've taken as our starting point is the Euston Area Action Planning that was developed by Camden Council in conjunction with ourselves, GLA and TfL. But we will pause for a minute if we may, just on this permeability issue, because we think it's very, very central. I know Martin wants to talk a bit about that.

306. MR SAGAR: Clearly, you've visited the site, and, clearly, also, you'll have seen the extraordinary success of what's going on behind St Pancreas. We think there's a second opportunity for that at the back of Euston Station, partly over Euston Station, potentially. But the key thing to make any development successful is the idea of permeability. We imagine it like a, kind of – the same way the internet works, that actually the greater number of links, the greater the amount of information that can be carried. So in pedestrian flow terms, the greater number of routes there are, the greater number of opportunities there are for development, because the greater number of addresses for business, for shops, and for residential projects could happen.

307. So we think the east-west route, which currently is blocked, as Simon just pointed out, by the blank walls of Euston Station, could actually be a very, very important thing in increasing the number of links from St Pancreas's success story through Somers Town, which is currently a kind of island of impenetrability, and off as far as Regent's Park to the left, but also connecting through to the British Land projects in Euston Road, as well as being able to bring a greater number of people via a greater number of routes into Camden Town itself.

308. Next slide, please. Whenever we're trying to describe what's sometimes a difficult idea to a client or to our fellow colleagues, it's always good to find an example which we believe works and an example which we believe is relevant. And this was one we picked, which is Gare Montparnasse. The interesting thing about that is you can see the park in the middle, which is an integral part of the surrounding business in those office buildings, but it's also an integral part of the broader district. The station is accessible from the rather strange shaped building you can see in the centre of the picture there with the curved facades. It's also accessible from the long building at the bottom of the slide. But beneath this park – in other words, you actually access the



station below this level. This is the roof of the station, effectively. In so doing, you've actually made it so that the station is no longer a building which just faces like a palace onto Euston Road, for example, but it's actually an integral part of the fabric. We believe that this is the kind of consideration that should be brought to the redevelopment of Euston Station and funded by the mechanism which Simon referred to right at the start of the presentation, but also treated more along the lines of the GLA and Camden Town study which we showed you in the previous slide in terms of the way the routes work. So the station would become an integral part of the city, not a single, impenetrable block within the city.

309. MR PITKEATHLEY: I think that's the basis of our case.

310. CHAIR: Anything to add? We've discussed these issues before, so –

311. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Actually, I'd just refer the Committee to section 2 of the Camden Assurance Letter dealing with the Euston Station design where principles of permeability amongst many other principles are ones that are fully taken into account in the detailed design of Euston Station. You've heard a lot about permeability and our aspirations for that in the process already.

312. CHAIR: And we had a lot of discussions with the Camden officers about, instead of having blank walls, you know, putting shops and businesses there to try and – you know, rather than have half a street. So we understand the issues.

313. MR PITKEATHLEY: Do we have the capacity to respond or –

314. CHAIR: Yes. Appropriately.

315. MR SAGAR: Just quickly, our abiding concern is – and now I'm going to refer to something that has already been discussed this evening, I believe, we heard it on the monitor earlier, but it is the issue of how one deals with that height change from east to west, in that however the HS2 side of the station is developed, if the main body of Euston remains as it is, the change in level you would need to accommodate in order to cross the station and the relationship between those two parts is the bit that concerns us the most. You'll be aware as you walk up the big flight of stairs to the east of Euston Station quite how massive that change in level is, and it's about how that – how the

permeability would work given that that physical obstacle is our concern.

316. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Just remembering, by the way, that you aren't objecting, but local objections meant that the first Act of parliament to have the railway line built had it stopping at Chalk Farm. Another Act had to come on two years later to get it brought down to Euston.

317. MR SAGAR: Yes.

318. CHAIR: We're already planning our trip to Paris.

319. MR PITKEATHLEY: Very good. And I think, to re-emphasise Martin's point, there's permeability and there's permeability, and, I think, you know, what is being discussed at the moment is not permeability in the way that we mean it. So we'll ask the Committee to consider that.

320. CHAIR: All right. Thank you very much to you both for your contribution. Next one, 1415 North Bridge House School. 1415 North Bridge House School. Not here. 1349, AP3: 62 Primavera Boman-Behram in person. Sorry, I hope I've pronounced your name right. Hello.

**Primavera R. Boman-Behram**

321. MS BOMAN-BEHRAM: Hi. I'm Primavera Boman-Behram. I'm at 27 Oval Road NW1. The reason I'm here is I'm petitioning to save my health and house from the many diverse impacts of HS2. So it's a very personal thing. The east tunnel is roughly 50 metres on the kerb away from the property. Many of the effects that are mentioned in HS2 limited data are based on assumptions and not on reality. I've already experienced personally what lies ahead and that for far beyond a decade.

322. My house has been in my family for 57 years when my mother taught modern dance in the basement. It now houses her archives until an appropriate institution will be able to procure it. The house is fragile – old, very fragile, old Georgian one, terrace between three others, and they have an article for direction in addition to being in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area. I have a photo of a big crack that I found from World War II. Apparently there is a big crack that we're going to have to fix. So it really is a fragile house.

323. In 2004, when they fabricated a huge complex of flats where Gilbeys Yard used to be, my fairly new rendering started to have fine cracks. Then in 2006 when they took some sort of stretcher out from under Oval Road, the entire street felt gross vibrations. We were kind of sitting there like that on a chair, all the way up Oval Road. From one day to the other, cracks enlarged. I remember that when the faster version trains joined the WMCL trains, more cracks appeared, and the faster trains would interrupt my sleep. My neighbour made the same comments. Last summer, when these tracks were cleared of overgrown vegetation at night, the machine noises made sleep absolutely impossible.

324. After I had discovered I had cancer in 2007, and there was no cancer in my family's history whatsoever, I found out that a few neighbours on my side of the street also had cancer. I noticed as well that several mogul towers appeared fairly recently on the roof opposite, and at the same time, after decades of perfect television reception, it got quite rotten.

325. I read that HS2 states that there will be a negligible electromagnetic radiation from the massive tunnel boring machine or the high speed train, but I beg to differ.

326. Going back to 2009 when Thames water changed the pipes in Oval Road, my basement completely flooded. In the flood reinstatement I lost money and I fell nine feet from the hoist, breaking several bones, so my therapy continues, and I'm still in pain.

327. I should maybe show the map of utilities. I don't know. Of course, every time major construction takes place, even in a tiny basement up the road, rats appear. I've had them too.

328. As for air pollution, my street was already bad from all the traffic. I tend to open the windows only at weekends when the air quality is better. So if cars and lorries were to bypass the construction routes down Oval Road, my old house, road and London, suffered, and I already had caught this year for 11 months but I'd never, ever had that before.

329. When in New York a few years ago, I experienced an almost collapse of a six floor loft building. It happened while constructing a huge sporting goods shop adjacent.

They dug down three floors but one of New York's biggest construction firms was structurally negligent, so they won millions and millions of dollars.

330. Sound vibration and air quality has been mention by many already. But the effects of tunnelling I don't think have been mentioned too much. Tunnel induced building deformation is an interactive problem. Take Big Ben, for example, and the Jubilee Mine. And then to have the canal so close affecting the ground water is a disaster waiting to happen as it did in Cologne in Archive Museum in 2009 when it collapsed because of nearby tunnelling. And there are other examples I can give.

331. I will now list my needs in this situation which has been imposed on me. I would like double or triple glazed conservation approved sash windows, and not just for the noise but also for the air quality, because I have old papers in the alcove from 1920, from India, from Vienna, and they would all get ruined. If the frames cannot support the heavy windows then the frames will have to be removed as well. I did change the sashes but only single, from 2002. After 9/11 in New York where the government issued HEPA air purifiers and vacuum cleaners, I asked for several such air purifiers and all extra electricity output paid for the entire duration.

332. I would like to have an air quality monitor no more than 50 metres away from me. And traffic monitoring as the old road was not built for that and the vibration will also affect my house which barely has a foundation.

333. I would like an independent surveyor to monitor movement and damage before, during and after, also to be paid by HS2.

334. As house insurance pretty much doesn't pay for hydraulic ground seepage, I want a binding undertaking from HS2 to pay for any damage to my house as a result of ground movement; in other words, to foot the cost of any damage. I request that special measures have indication for a reduction in property price because of HS2 construction if I am forced to sell. A special measure to make good any damage to my alcove as well, please, if you can.

335. Then I finally say, what about all the people, you know, that I know in my area that haven't petitioned? What happens to them? I have two old friends. One is 94 and the other is in her 80s. They're completely self-sufficient. Act like young people. But

they're going to be marooned in their home, because at the top of Over Road, opposite Regent Park Terrace, the utility works at the north end are going to just maroon them into their house, god knows for how many months.

336. CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. Ms Lean, any –

337. MS LEAN (DfT): Briefly, sir, if it assists, it might help just to bring up P12674. I know that Ms Boman-Behram was particularly concerned about damage to her property as a result of ground movement or settlement. These are settlement contours that have been produced for this area. You'll see that the petitioner's property is well outside even the settlement contour. So even on that worst case –

338. MS BOMAN-BEHRAM: That's not true, because the burettes move much further than the tunnel –

339. CHAIR: You're supposed to let the promoter respond and then you have the final say.

340. MS LEAN (DfT): The assessment that we've carried out doesn't give rise to any concern there should be problems for, sort of, settlement or timing works to this petitioner's property. Similarly, there's been an assessment made about ground bore noise or vibration, and they are very, very small, the receptor; it's well below the lower levels. We've taken the Committee to those levels, which are in the appendix 2 information paper, E23. The figures that we've got here, I can take – if – you know, if you find it helpful are of an order of magnitude below those lower levels.

341. In terms of traffic, just to identify that over the road is not a construction traffic route. There are some limited utility works happening in this area. Perhaps, I think, if the petitioner wanted to go to this slide, if we could just put up P12679, see what's proposed in this area along here and you'll see identify that Albert Road and Gloucester Crescent, potentially protected or diverted, and you see the levels there and the likely duration, and the two way vehicle movements.

342. I heard the concern about neighbours being stranded in the road. The Committee's heard how you would ordinarily seek to manage the sort of utility works that we're in a position where we're cutting of access to certain residential properties

whilst people are carrying out those works.

343. I hope that has picked up on the main points. The Committee's already heard from us about things like the Need to Sell Scheme.

344. CHAIR: And essentially the assurances to Camden in that air qualities can be regularly checked, and if there is a problem then there is a remedy in the form of looking at double glaze and triple – whatever is needed for people like this lady.

345. MS LEAN (DfT): Indeed, sir. I'm grateful that you reminded me of that point. I was going to note that obviously the insurance that Mr Strachan took you to earlier, it does not that obviously assessment, monitoring, review are all to be agreed with the local authority, so in terms of where monitoring points will be, then that will be picked up generally as part of that work that we have to undertake with Camden. And you've heard about the action plans that would have to be put into place if we're still predicting significant effects.

346. CHAIR: Where's the nearest monitoring point, approximately?

347. MS LEAN (DfT): From the assessment we have in the standard pack, there's two on Oval Road, one either end. So there have been –

348. CHAIR: Okay.

349. MS LEAN (DfT): So in terms as assessments that have been done as part of the ES there are two assessment locations on Oval Road. As regards monitoring going forward, I just can't say where those are going to be at the moment. But that will be something that will be worked out with Camden in due course. The Committee will be aware as well that as part of the air quality and engagement insurance to be given to Camden there's reference to publishing information about things to include, as a minimum, air quality, noise, vibration. So that information will be made available as the construction phases goes on.

350. CHAIR: Okay. The petitioner's now allowed final points. We don't want all these ancient papers you've got in your hands to be ruined and your health to be ruined. You're allowed to say a few brief comments.

351. MS BOMAN-BEHRAM: There have been a whole slew of tunnel attributes. I mean, I have some listed here but there have been a lot. And it's always because construction has to save money, save time, and they cut corners and quick, quick, quick, and that's when it happens. And how come now, already, where my road is, and a lot of people are suffering from coughs, and it's way above the EU, way above, in terms of pollution, and that pollution, when the nitrogen dioxide combines with a particular matter, it can float miles away, so you might be affected even. I mean, we're not really dealing with this, not as I see it. This is before the thing happened.

352. CHAIR: Thank you very much for your point of view. Thanks for sitting patiently at the back as well. Nice to meet you. Right. We now go on to AP3: 13 and 467 and 1764 which are the Conlon Family of the Dublin Castle, represented by Henry Conlon.

#### **The Conlon Family and the Dublin Castle P.H.**

353. MR CONLON: Good evening. For the sake of repetition, I'd like to agree with the points on air quality and noise with petition number 1683 which was just a few moments ago, Peter Lyons on behalf of the Harwood Street, Clarence Way and Hartland Road Residents Association.

354. My name is Henry Conlon and I'm the licensee of the Dublin Castle. I've been there 42 years. We operate the Dublin Castle with my mother and my brother. Would you please permit me to just hand around these pictures of the pub so you can see who we are. Thank you. It's only a single picture. Right.

355. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: What's the address of the pub?

356. MR CONLON: It's 94 Park Way, Camden Town. I'd like to utilise the promoter's maps and exhibit, please.

357. CHAIR: Okay.

358. MR CONLON: First of all, the standard location map, just to show our close proximity to the works. We operate primarily as a music venue, and we have a capacity of 311 people where we cater for fledgling musicians and unsigned bands almost nightly. Often it's the first time they appear in front of an audience. It's fair to state

that we give an opportunity for musicians at a grass roots level.

359. We provided a performance space for meaningful, creative, and the artistic needs of the local community and the music industry in the UK and sometimes beyond. Bands may come to us in London on tour from abroad, for instance. This goes far beyond just another business in Camden Town. We provide facility here were the community –

360. CHAIR: I'm afraid I'm going to have to interrupt you. Order. Order. Division in the house. I adjourn for 15 minutes.

*Sitting suspended*

*On resuming—*

361. CHAIR: Order. Order. Welcome back.

362. MR CONLON: Welcome. I'm Henry Conlon from the Dublin Castle in 94 Park Way, Camden Town.

363. In the 1870s the railway companies built four pubs: the Dublin Castle, the Windsor Castle, and Caernarfon Castle and the Edenborough Castle, to keep the English, the Irish, the Scottish and the Welsh navvies apart because they were causing mayhem. This time it's the railway company causing mayhem, and I'm here today to try and defend our business and Park Way.

364. We operate primarily as a music venue. I have a capacity of 311 people. We cater for inexperienced bands. Sometimes it's the first time they ever appear in front of an audience. Often there's no audience at all, unfortunately, and –

365. CHAIR: Yes. Like Parliament, then.

366. MR CONLON: Very good. And we survive on beer sales, especially at weekends. We provide a performance space for meaningful, creative and artistic needs of the community and the music industry.

367. MR CLIFTON-BROWN: Have you discovered any stars?

368. MR CONLON: Any stars?



369. MR CLIFTON-BROWN: Yes.

370. MR CONLON: Yes. I'm going to get to that. Actually, whilst we had our break a few minutes ago, I'm blessed, because the gentlemen behind said they're all rooting for me because his son was in a band and the gentleman the other side of him said he had another family member – I'm sorry, who had a brother in a band. It's quite widespread, you see. Maybe in your families you have a son or a daughter or you play a musical instrument yourself. The aim is to get you out of your bedrooms and garages and down onto a stage, and this is what we do.

371. On many occasions, bands have been signed in our pub on their first appearance. These bands have gone onwards to promote the UK music industry and to underline Camden Town as a world centre for like music.

372. There is a successful vibrant feature here in Camden Town – and we're one of them, the Dublin Castle. Her Majesty had Madness performing on the roof of Buckingham Palace during the Diamond Jubilee Celebrations. The Olympics also saw Madness represent UK music in the closing ceremony. Madness played and started in the Dublin Castle back in – I think it was 1979. We've been doing this an awful long time. Other bands include Travis who came down from Glasgow, played their first London gig in the Dublin Castle, got signed that night. The Arctic Monkeys. Blur. Amy Winehouse graced our stage. She even used to serve customers and pull a few pints, you know. It was very good for tours and goblets were sold.

373. We have never, ever received any funding. We have survived to date on the back of hard work and beer sales. These sales help us to subsidise the nights when nobody shows up to watch the bands. We operate on a turnover that allows us to maintain and upkeep the building and to keep the very high regulations that are enforced by the local authority in check.

374. Despite this, we've had a long list of world recognised performers who have all graced our small stage in this venue. We serve the music industry, and have done so since the 1970s, as well as tourism in London. We are blessed to be able to provide the opportunity for the public to watch their favourite performers, sometimes famous in this intimate environment. The Dublin Castle is a keystone element in Camden's cultural history.

375. This proven facility which we provided at this premises begs me to ask today to recognise the Dublin Castle Petition as a special case. We ask the promoter to recognise this, to please recognise its importance to Camden, to London, and to the United Kingdom, and to support this iconic venue's survival.

376. I've been to a charity event in this house with the Amy Winehouse Foundation. As I've said, Amy has performed at the Dublin Castle. People come along, magic happens, and they go on – and good things happen, charity and the UK music industry, jobs are created, employment is created.

377. We survive on passing trade, pedestrian footfall and word of mouth. The business will not survive without customers. We must supplement the hosting of live music events with sales. The bands who practice in their garages and bedrooms do not always bring crowds. We provide the first stepping stone on the launch pad to the UK music industry.

378. We have fame at Dublin Castle. We're well known. We're held in high regards to music fans and to musicians. This small family business is what we do and it's all we know. This is our income and livelihood. Whilst we are merely custodians to this business, my 14 year old son made me overjoyed recently when he asked if he could work with us. It seemed to be an enormous weight off his shoulders and a great reassurance to him. I'm now fearing that I may no longer be able to deliver this opportunity for him, and then the opportunity for the third generation of my family to run this business that we've worked so long at.

379. CHAIR: Can we focus on why you think the business will be affected and what you want?

380. MR CONLON: I'm about to, sir. Thank you. Our petition highlights that road closures, cessation of pedestrian access and the loss of ability to park vehicles for loading and unloading will quickly cause the demise and closure of this venue. We request that HS2 give written assurance that the business will be promptly reimbursed for loss of business. Only will this allow continuity of this iconic facility.

381. HS2 will be a blight on this business, this established business, and its survival. It cannot be relocated. Of course, also, nobody wants a music venue to move next to

them, wherever they are.

382. Could you please show HS2 exhibit P12664. It's an aerial view map. This shows the proximity to the pub, and also the amount of work that's going to be going around into Albert Street and Delancey Street. Thank you.

383. We usually have three bands per night, but we can often have five or more. Everyone needs to load up their equipment before and after the gig. Whilst it's a rite of passage for musicians to start off playing in a small venue, word of mouth will soon get around about how difficult the whole process is to get into the venue and breweries and also highly likely musicians will choose not to bother at all, bringing beer and equipment to the venue and eventually bands will be deterred from performing here. They won't want to carry drum kits and amplifiers hundreds of metres; the walk would be dreadful. The travelling fans won't be able to mark anywhere. Some bands occasionally bring a culture of revellers to other parts of the UK. These fans usually shop locally and eat locally and support the local community. Our venue has an economic value to many other surrounding businesses.

384. I'm also concerned about access for emergency vehicles, especially firefighters. The safety of our patrons is paramount. Access to this venue is paramount for our survival. HS2 Exhibit P12853 demonstrates that the Hybrid Bill limits are right on the curtilage of the double parcel. Thank you. I fear that not only will HS2 create huge trenches in the parkway to accommodate the diversion of utilities, it may find the need to take compulsory purchase of our sellers as they've provisionally stated to residents Albert Street. A pub cannot operate without a seller. We would like written assurances that this is not an option. We request assurances in the form of a letter from HS2 that they can provide regular access so we can continue to provide gigs.

385. We need an effective point of contact because just phoning up the local authority can take an age just to speak to the correct people. We require commitments contractually by HS2 to set up arrangements and also there would be the spur of the moment situations. We request service level agreements in writing. We require engagement with the venue prior to construction contracts commencing. Gigs and band tours are often booked 10 weeks in advance, Dublin Castle is often contractually obliged to have the venue facility ready for musicians. Tickets are sold by bands on

tour well in advance. There has been no community engagement and I would like the promoter to assure us that they will not just pass the buck and tell us to deal with Camden Council.

386. HS2's consultation to businesses and residents in Parkway has been, at best, fake. I think we're all in for a shock. We ask for a hotline to deal with occasions where for instance there is a pneumatic drill operating outside whilst a band is performing. A site manager and a team may be under penalty to deliver and not be so sympathetic to our circumstances for instance. Also that will be a big moment for the band and they want to do their best. We ask that HS2 write to us, the petitioners, to underline and reinforce these points. We must have something to fall back on. We need effective points of contact in practice at local level.

387. We would like to see some funding from HS2 to support our venue, to demonstrate that it intends to support live music instead of being to its detriment. We are also used to street works in London but never on this scale. Our outside space is the curtilage of the pub. We often get smokers and patrons taking some outside air. If there is gasworks being carried out and no doubt this will happen when they divert the utilities, we require some sort of safeguards that our customers will still be permitted to enjoy this facility. The additional noise, vibration, dust and fumes are bound to discourage punters from visiting us as well; there will be a downturn in business. This small family business is self-sufficient with only customers providing our income. It's very unfair that HS2 can put an end to this after decades of hard work by a family. It's very reasonable to request written assurance that sufficient compensation will be given by HS2 to our loss of business and probably the family home.

388. CHAIR: How much more have you got to go?

389. MR CONLON: Just specific assurances. For HS2 to give specific assurances for the following pleas: guarantee continuous, safe pedestrian access to the venue; to provide flexible parking outside the venue for deliveries and band equipment to suit musical performance times; to form a response team who can speedily negotiate business rate reduction, postponement and cessation if delays to trading are caused – business rates are our greatest overheads and non-payment is strictly and speedily enforced by collection agencies. Alternatively, we require HS2 to be prepared to pay

our business rates upon the venue's behalf. HS2 should give other assurances that it will promptly settle other such overheads such as the BID levy and the newly arriving late night levy, as we'll not be able to raise income to pay for these either.

390. There is no fair compensation scheme that is fair or proportionate presently. The promoter needs to change this. We request written assurance that we will directly benefit from the business local economy fund. We require continuity of this small family business and the continuation to operate as a music venue. The closure of parkway in part will have serious consequences to our business continuity. The severance of pedestrian access and vehicular access is of particular concern. Redirection of utilities: this business requires a continuous supply of water and electricity to maintain basic health and safety. The severance and redirection of utilities will prevent this. Continued services for sewage and direct access for waste removal are essential. Trenches being dug directly outside the venue with compressors and excavators will make the performance of gigs pointless. Customers will not be able to relax while listening to the on-going construction works often just metres away.

391. The Dublin Castle is a Victorian building. Its construction may not survive typical trench support routed outside. Vibration may cause cracking to foundations and the core structure of this property. Once again, please treat the Dublin Castle as a special case. Thank you very much for listening to my petition.

392. CHAIR: Thank you.

393. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Can I ask you how long Dublin Castle's been at that building?

394. MR CONLON: It's always the Dublin Castle since 1880.

395. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: What was it called before?

396. MR CONLON: It was always there and it's always been called the Dublin Castle. It's never changed its name.

397. CHAIR: Ms Lean?

398. MS LEAN (DfT): Thanks for that. I wonder if we could just start by putting out

the construction plan for this location and this may assist us in just explaining a little more about what's going on and why it's the promoter's view that there shouldn't be impact on this business such as to cause it to relocate or be put out of business or be less desirable as a live music venue or otherwise and to be able to continue to operate as it is now.

399. P1263, you'll see the Dublin Castle's marked in the usual way with a red line and the closest construction works are the works you've heard about previously, Park Village East and the construction of the Euston Portal limits and tunnel. The Committee's previously heard from us about how we're going to manage those utilities, I think you've been taken to the utilities works happening in that area. We fully understand and appreciate this petitioner's concerns about access and the need to maintain deliveries and to add to that we have sent the petitioner an assurance which should be at – sorry, I lost my reference number, P13392 – I think was sent out at the end of last week, so it's possible it may not have reached the petitioner yet but if we can go over onto page 2, and this is particularly regarding the utility works happening in this area, assurance number 1. Sorry, P13392, unfortunately we haven't got it but I wonder if I could briefly give the gist of it as it would benefit the Committee and the petitioner?

400. CHAIR: Yes.

401. MS LEAN (DfT): First, that the nominated undertaker shall engage with the petitioners prior to the completion of the detailed design of the traffic management associated with the utility works with a view to reducing as far as reasonably practicable any disruption caused by utility works to the Dublin Castle. Secondly, the nominated undertaker shall have regard to representations made during the engagement referred to and in consultation with the relevant highway authority and give due consideration to the following factors during the detailed design of those arrangements with a view to reducing any significant adverse effects of those works on the Dublin Castle as far as reasonably practicable and subject to the usual requirements of the construction programme. It particularly identifies timing any particularly disruptive short term utility works to avoid hours of peak activity, so hopefully that's hit on the petitioner's concern about the amount of drills during gigs and maintaining access for customers, staff, deliveries and bands to the Dublin Castle. Thirdly, there's a requirement for the nominated undertaker in the code of construction practice to give reasonable advance

notice of the utility works to the petitioners.

402. So I hope that picks up on what seems to be of particular concern for these petitioners which was about being able to get themselves deliveries, bands, clients to the pub – sorry, to the Dublin Castle without interruption during the construction works. There are slides in the pack about traffic in this location. I wasn't proposing to go to them but it's a small order of magnitude, it's not a – it's in the 10s of HGVs, compared to existing levels of the hundreds, so we're not putting in hundreds and hundreds of HGVs down the road if that's a concern about access. In a daily flow of 15,000, as I've been helpfully reminded by Mr Mould, so it's a very small amount of traffic we are adding to existing traffic on the parkway.

403. I understand the concern about parking. Obviously there may be some need to suspend some parking areas to accommodate the rolling utility works there but that's obviously something that could be looked at as part of the traffic management process there would be re-provision of alternative parking facilities in respect of the Dublin Castle if the immediate area is suspended for any reason.

404. A concern was raised I think about the cellars and the loss of the cellars. Just to clarify, I think Mr Conlon referred to the limits of deviation going directly up to the front of the Dublin Castle. The powers that we take there are in respect of doing works on the highway for the utility works. These are dealt with under schedule 12 of the bill in an express provision in the bill which says we take land for highway purposes. That does not include any vaults, cellars, arches belonging to properties on the highway so there's no suggestion that we'll be taking part of the cellars from the Dublin Castle if that was a concern and I'm very happy for somebody to put that in a letter to these petitioners because I understand why that was a concern that may not have been explained properly before.

405. As regards to noise, again we do have some noise levels there but we're not predicting significant noise levels on the Dublin Castle. The main noise level you might expect are from the utility works in this area which will be of a short duration and of the sort of magnitude that we've been talking about previously, so again, we wouldn't see any reason why Dublin Castle shouldn't be able to continue to operate as a successful music venue as it's been doing for the past 40 or so years.

406. CHAIR: Okay. Brief final comments Mr Conlon?

407. MR CONLON: The late, great Amy Winehouse, when receiving an award, said after the fire of Camden, 'Camden Town ain't burning down. I fear Camden Town is closing down or may close down with the HS2'. I agree you were unable to find the assurance P13392. I haven't got it either and I would like that please. We consider the Dublin Castle to be a jewel in Camden Town's live music crowd. This heritage should be preserved at all costs. Economically live music in this town goes hand in hand with its markets. It's famed and copied the world over and envied. Once it's eroded it may never return. We are honoured for this family business to have played such a part and recognised role in Camden and in UK's music history. Thank you all for listening to my petition.

408. CHAIR: Thank you, Peter?

409. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Can I say that when the late great Mr Conlon died in 2009 that was 30 years after two important things happened in 1979, one was him bringing madness in and the second was Margaret Thatcher winning an election.

410. CHAIR: Thank you very much for your contribution. Have you got a copy of the –

411. MR CONLON: Thank you.

412. CHAIR: Alright. We now have 1261, AP3: 27, Simon Lewis and 1262, AP3: 28 Regents Park Terrace Residents' Association Limited. Welcome.

**Simon Lewis and Regents Park Terrace Residents Association**

413. MR LEWIS: Thank you, Chairman, for giving me the opportunity to present this petition on my behalf and on behalf of the residents of Regents Park Terrace. You'll be pleased to hear at this late state it's two for the price of one in that I'm speaking both to 1261 and 1262. It's been a very interesting afternoon and as Chair of the Residents Association I'm pleased to present some of our remarks. Perhaps I can actually start by noting the open and positive way in which the HS2 team have approached these communications and consultation exercise. Everyone of course believes they live in a unique place but Regents Park Terrace is a Grade 2 Listed terrace with only 22 houses



within the Primrose Hill conservation area.

414. Perhaps we could just see Exhibit A17531 please, and you can see there the terrace sits at the top of Gloucester Crescent, runs parallel to Oval Road and to the west of the Parkway intersection and I'm pleased to report that the Dublin Castle is our local. Perhaps we could now go to Exhibit A17534, which is a photograph which I think gives a good sense of how we sit back from Oval Road so you can see the terrace there is set back from Oval Road. It's a private one-way road with a narrow entrance in Oval Road and an exit in Gloucester Crescent. Parking in the terrace is for residents only and there are strict speed restrictions. The Residents' Association is well supported, highly engaged, and indeed one of the requirements of the association's constitution is to ensure that we maintain the terrace in good order including the private grassed area in the terrace, and if you could just pull up Exhibit 17533, which shows the grass there which is very carefully maintained by the terrace. So we're very proud of the terrace and there are a number of witness statements as exhibits which I hope make this clear.

415. Over the years many distinguished people have lived in the terrace including a late member of the House of Lords, Claus Moser, Sir Terence Conran, AJ Ayer, the Emanuels and even Morrissey, whose most famous single of course, 'Heaven knows I am miserable' which I insist to Mr Chairman this is no reflection on this afternoon's proceedings. We're just around the corner from the famous house in Gloucester Crescent where the *Lady in the Van* was filmed.

416. The various issues that affect the terrace are covered in other petitions so I won't repeat them all now obviously because time is short, but let me just emphasise those areas which are of particular importance to us. Firstly, one of our main issues in relation to HS2 is access. Given the position of the terrace it's crucially important that vehicular access be maintained, both to allow cars in and out of the terrace but importantly so that residents of the terrace can continue with their day to day activities and of course to allow access for essential services such as waste collection, recycling and the emergency services. We understand from HS2's response to our petition that the works will be carried out on utilities lying below the junction of Oval Road and Gloucester Crescent. That is the exiting terrace and if we could look at Exhibit A17538 at this stage, so you'll see there from the junction that's where the utility works are believed to likely to take place. They're predicted by HS2 to last up to 12 months and due to start in 2017. It's

absolutely vital that vehicles can come in and out of the terrace and that maintained at all times during the project and we ask in particular that access to the terrace is unfettered during the utility works.

417. Now we have received an assurance letter from HS2 regarding access during the utility works, but we'd like another in similar terms to address our concerns about access for duration of the whole project. HS2 have agreed in principle to do this. HS2 have also confirmed with respect to the promoter's Exhibit P12699 – that should be a map. So HS2 have also confirmed in respect to the pink area which is shaded in Oval Road which – and this is very important obviously that that only refers to the utility works and perhaps I could ask Mr Chairman through you, Mr Mould to confirm that. We're also very concerned that given the inevitable increase in traffic on Oval Road drivers may use Oval Road as a cut through and whilst traveling at a speed might cause a nasty, if not fatal accident as there are children who regularly play in the street. In order to prevent this, the association will have to erect barriers at the entrance to the terrace, if we could have Exhibit A17535, please. That shows the very narrow entrance into Regent's Park Terrace so our second ask is that should they be required, the cost of putting place gates at both ends of the terrace should be paid for by HS2 – I'll just quickly put up if you don't mind A17 –

418. MR CLIFTON-BROWN: So this is a private road?

419. MR LEWIS: This is a private road and if you put up A17536 it'll show you the exit to this private road. So, it's a very narrow entrance and then it's a one way out to the exit there so we believe, as an association this will prevent traffic from using the terrace as a shortcut in the event of congestion on Oval Road and as we've heard from Mr Conlon there are real concerns that there's bound to be additional pressure on people seeking to park in the area. I won't because of time talk in detail about the quality of air but it is obviously a concern to us as it is to many other residents of Camden Town. We would just ask that HS2 monitors this constantly on the terrace as part of its obligation to ensure there is minimal health hazards created by works.

420. Finally, we ask that HS2 does everything within its power to ensure that communication is as timely as possible as there's great uncertainty caused by this project and we have a number of very elderly residents and others who are

understandably concerned and unnerved by the project. We also need to know in advance if there are any major changes to the project. Fiona Goldberg and Joe Delany who are fellow residents of Regents Park Terrace and have been very closely involved in our preparations for this event are here with us this evening and together we would of course be happy to answer any questions.

421. CHAIR: That sounds very clear and brief, thank you. Ms Lean, you're going to be very clear and brief I suppose?

422. MS LEAN (DfT): Sir, just to confirm Oval Road is only showing four utilities works – that was the point I was going to confirm by the petitioner so I hope that provides some reassurances of sorts.

423. CHAIR: Okay.

424. MS LEAN (DfT): As regards to traffic management obviously as the Committee will be aware we're going to be looking at traffic management plans with the local authority and other stakeholders, and clearly things like this are things that can be looked at as part of keeping those traffic management plans under review to see how things are working in the area with any other discussions probably best left until that point in time.

425. CHAIR: And even with the private road, will that be taken into account? I mean, you're discussing the local authority roads, would you discuss the impact of the private road or not?

426. MS LEAN (DfT): I know one thing that's been picked up in this area is obviously the modelling we've done does pick up some diversionary routes so obviously I'm not sure if that will pick up private roads or not but I'm sure that through the engagement process if there are concerns that private roads are being used as rat runs that is something that would be flagged up with for example Camden and could be part of those discussions at that time. And we'll obviously know that through engagement with the residents. You've seen the commitment that we – because I've put it up on the screen but we have given reassurance to the petitioners about engagements with the utilities works. I am seeing nodding from behind about any making sure there's access generally so no doubt there will continue to be an engagement with the residents'

association regarding timely works for this area and if they do have concerns there is no running no doubt that is something we'll raise at that time and can be taken forward either with the residents' association or with Camden.

427. CHAIR: Clearly the project will sweep up the fact that there's a private road here and there's some concern pending further discussions with Camden.

428. MS LEAN (DfT): Yes.

429. CHAIR: Okay, brief final comment?

430. MR LEWIS: Chairman, you'll be delighted to hear given time is short I have no further comment but thank you for your time.

431. CHAIR: Thank you indeed.

432. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: You've communicated very well.

433. CHAIR: Right, we now move on to AP3: 133, 60 AP3: 15, 427 AP3: 19, 1001 AP3: 104, 6 AP: 387, AP3: 31, 1510 AP3: 41, 1509, all the Stephenson Way businesses and communities and doctors represented by Mr Purchas.

### **Stephenson Way businesses and communities**

434. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Stephenson Way. It's volume 1.

435. CHAIR: It's getting quite late so I hope you're going to be punctual and get through what you have to do as quickly as you can.

436. MR PURCHAS QC: It is very late and I've got quite a lot to get through but we'll traverse as well as we can. I represent a group of several petitioners; you've got the details of them. If I may explain what we seek, and if I might just say that each of the petitioners are a part of charitable organisations performing important public functions involving obviously sensitive and vulnerable uses.

437. We don't come to the Committee to obstruct HS2 because their wider objectives we plainly understand, on the contrary we've sought to approach the proposals constructively and now as part of a group and each of the petitioners who I represent have invested heavily in Euston and are active contributors to its growing renaissance.

Our concerns are both real and immediate. Our premises are located directly adjacent to work sites scheduled to be active for many years as well as significant railhead and utility work sites. Now, recently there has finally been some degree of response from the promoters to our concerns so I can start briefly explaining what's not been addressed and what the Committee can readily do about it.

438. We had discussions this afternoon which have been useful and as a matter of overall approach I would ask the Committee to address the principal of five issues which we hope will facilitate continuing negotiations with the promoters and produce an acceptable basis for our protection and if the promoters fall short we'll have to pursue it in another place and I hope that's satisfactory to the Committee. The five points we want to raise, none of them are covered by the assurances to Camden, TFL or indeed in the code of construction practice or information papers.

439. The first is airborne and ground-borne noise and vibration and I note straight away that in the context of these works and the sensitive uses that we carry on, ground-borne noise is of particular concern. We seek very simply that for the identified sensitive uses the nominated undertaker should be required to make an assessment of the appropriate target levels, having regard to their own identified levels for each form of emission, that's airborne or ground-borne and vibration, and then the design of the works, together with any mitigation can be taken forward on that basis. There can then be monitoring as has already been accepted by the promoters and an action plan as to what should be done where there's failure to achieve the target. It's known as a target action plan. That's not novel. That's not rocket science. That's an established approach with recent major infrastructure projects, such as the Victoria station upgrade. There are the sensitive uses, including a theatre and hotels, and the Thames tunnel, and indeed, Crossrail.

440. Now, in the Camden Assurance, paragraph 10.10, it was finally acknowledged that while arrangements for mitigation only applied to residential properties, buildings that were particularly sensitive to airborne noise, but only airborne noise, would be subject to individual consideration by the nominated undertaker. That would be subject on the application of anyone responsible for the building. Now, very recently, and I mean the end of last week, an amended information paper on construction noise at C23, following Camden's appearance last Wednesday, I think it was, has been placed on the

website. And that contains what we believe we wanted confirmed – are two general insurances, that are important.

441. The first is in annex B, paragraph 7. ‘While the discretionary arrangements for installation and rehousing only apply to residential properties, particularly sensitive buildings, including educational and community, will be subject to individual consideration by the nominated undertaker, on the application of the owner or person responsible. So first, then, there is at least acknowledgement that there will be that individual consideration, and secondly, in paragraph 3.4, it’s said that to deliver the policy aims, reasonable steps will be taken to control noise and vibration from the construction of the proposed scheme, to the levels set out in tables 2 and 4 of appendix A, for noise-sensitive non-residential buildings. Those tables addressed airborne noise and vibration, which up until last Friday, weren’t subject to any form of obligation. Now, although the environmental statement does have, within it, levels for ground-borne noise, they remain without any application in the assurances, or otherwise.

442. Now, taken together, we proceed on the basis that this promoter means what he says in that information paper, but where a non-sensitive residential building is identified, it will be individually assessed that reasonable steps were taken to control at least airborne noise and vibration affecting that building, to the levels and tables 2 and 4. And so that leaves two important matters to be covered. First, the appropriate levels need to be addressed for the particular use, and that includes, of course, ground-borne noise, and second, there needs to be a firm, identifiable framework, to ensure that following design and any mitigation, there is monitoring and triggers for action, and a palette of measures in the event of failure. Now, all we ask from the Committee, in light of the evidence, that they endorse that approach which is common to other major infrastructure projects. That’s point one. Point two is design; design of the works. I start with timing. The Committee, I’m sure, will be aware –

443. CHAIR: Did you design this as your position?

444. MR PURCHAS QC: If only. No, this is designed on the works, and particularly designs of the works and the environmental impact. And the reason I start with timing is that already, the utilities contracts, as subject to procurement, intend us to be awarded next year, and a major part of disturbance in the Euston area is that utilities work. And

the main contract is now already subject to procurement procedures, with tenders out next year, and the award at the beginning of 2017. So it is crucial that there is a requirement on the nominated undertaker to consider the relevant design approaches, which can be adopted to contain the impact, and deliver the environmental objectives as part of the design. Now, regrettably, so far, the descriptions of the design approach lack, or are at odds, with that objective.

445. Now, Keith Farley, who is on my right, very experienced in major infrastructure projects, and the design approaches to which he will refer have been successfully adopted in recent major projects, with great environmental, and other benefit, to great importance to my clients, and with no adverse effect to either programme or cost. In particular, they can lead to reduction by design of the environmental effects which the Committee has been hearing over the past several weeks, and enhance the prospects for materials to be brought in, and waste taken out by rail. Specifically, it is an interest to us, because it means there is no need for the Cobourg Street compound, and what we look for is a commitment for a specific plan in addition and consultation on works, and the long-term design treatment in respect of premises which are subject to demolition of works beside our premises. That's Wolfstone House, the vent shaft, and Milton Street, beside the Royal College of General Practitioners. And what we ask the Committee to do, is to first indicate that these techniques, which we will explain to you, should at least be considered as part of the basic design process to secure the best environmental result. So all the indications at present is that they are not being considered, and secondly, but certainly, there should be a specific provision for adjacent works.

446. Third, I deal with surface and ground water flooding. The reason why we raise it in the Committee is that the flood risk assessment carried out by HS2 is, we believe, demonstrably unsound, in asserting that there will be no increase in ground water flood risk. And therefore, we are in the position that there is, in this area, no reliable flood risk assessment. The most recent strategic flood risk assessment of the area by Camden and associated authorities, which is evidently not taken into account by the HS2 FRA, which is a desktop study, identifies this area as one which is susceptible to elevated ground water levels, and vulnerable to surface water flooding. That's well reflected in recorded experience, as well as the 25 incidents of ground water flooding in this area. So of course, not just the effect of the station box on ground water flow, its impervious

box equivalent to some seven stories deep, but also the prevalence of risk of surface water flooding. One particular consideration is, again, that provision needs to be included as part of the main works design. Whether that's part of the SUMP, or other expedient to deal with the groundwater, not just the matter of tanking the basements of a premises which are un-tanked, and certainly in four of our cases, we have artefacts of considerable, indeed, international, historical and economic value in our basements. So what is required is an early and premises-specific flood risk assessment, which assesses the risks in consultation with ourselves, considers them a necessary design provision at the outset, and the protected measures. There then should be monitoring and a specific palette of remedial steps if there is failure. And we ask no more of this Committee than they should make clear that that should be done.

447. Fourthly, transportation. There are three matters on that. First, we recognise, at the end of the day, it's going to be for Camden as local highway authority, and TFL, to make the final decision on these matters. But we would seek a commitment from the promoters, that in applying to Camden, they make applications that reflect what has been agreed and proposed to this Committee, and the public, that subject to that approval, Gower Place, Euston Street, Stephenson Way and North Gower Street, will only be used by construction traffic for utility works in their streets. I add, they've agreed to that on Stephenson Way. Also, on Gordon Street, which you were hearing earlier this afternoon, should be avoided if at all possible, for the use by construction vehicles. We also ask that we are consulted on lorry construction routes, and on any provision for taxi holding areas or ranks, affecting the roads of which we are concerned.

448. Second on transportation, we are very concerned about disabled parking – not a matter that's been expressly addressed. We depend upon disabled parking, affecting both Stephenson Way and Endsleigh Gardens, and it should be retained or if not retained, it should be replaced with signage. And finally, and I thought this would be a given, the promoters create two cul-de-sacs during the works, as it's over a substantial period of time – that's Euston Street and Stephenson Way. They're service streets, servicing a number of streets, providing fire escapes, and it seems to us perfectly obvious that there should be some provision for vehicles to turn in them. There is none, and we gather it is controversial that there should be. We regard that as something which readily ought to be secured even, dare I say it, in adjusting the hoarding for the



compound. Finally, sir, buildings. Two matters on that. The Magic Circle's theatre is to be oversailed by construction cranes. The Committee will be well aware it's in public use, and the top floor is the theatre and performance space on the second top floor, and we simply seek protection, in the normal terms, that for instance, Network Rail would impose, for their assets, with crane oversailing. It's basic protection to preserve public safety, and indemnity against damage or injury. We regard that as perfectly common sense, and one that should be offered and provided.

449. Linked with that, we're offered an assurance, generally, to our premises, for remedial action in respect of settlement, but it is limited to settlement, as you'll know with works at depth that surround us – there's both tunnelling and open trenches of eight meters for asset diversion and subways – it's not only settlement. Ground heave, major water mains, flooding, and vibration damage, and it's perfectly obvious to us that damage in that respect should be included in the undertaking, together with the contents. So I just say, finally, in my introduction, we have a point which we regard as important of compensation. We've agreed to put that in writing, subject to the agreement of the Committee, or the Committee's clerk, and no doubt that'll be a satisfactory way of dealing with it.

450. So unless there's anything further, what I was going to do is call our expert evidence on engineering, following by noise and vibration, and then transportation and water, and then if it's of help to the Committee, very briefly, call the individual witnesses on specific concerns to their property. I endeavour to get through it as soon as I can. It was reduced, in the light of a discussion with the Committee clerk to 90 minutes. I'll do the best I can.

451. CHAIR: We may well have a vote – can we try to do it by quarter to ten?

452. MR PURCHAS QC: I will endeavour to do whatever I can, once the petition is properly heard.

453. CHAIR: Can your witnesses assume that we spent three weeks on Camden and Euston, so we know quite a bit also about vibration and noise? We don't know quite so much about water.

454. MR PURCHAS QC: Nor ground-borne ones. We'll see how we go. The first

series of clients is A1800, and can I have slide 2, please? Sorry, not 1800. My fault. This is A1769. A1769, slide 2.

455. CHAIR: We can read as fast as you can speak, so –

456. MR PURCHAS QC: Yes, I'm not going to go through it. Mr Farley is beside me. You have his qualifications.

457. MR FARLEY: We might have been together at the tunnel opening.

458. CHAIR: We were, as you'll recall.

459. MR PURCHAS QC: I'll say no more – and your experience of projects is set out there. Slide 3, the petitioner's properties, so numbered 1 to 12.

460. MR FARLEY: Both sides of Euston road and Stephenson way, further north.

461. MR PURCHAS QC: Indeed, and Gordon street. Both sides of Gordon Street. Go on to the works at 4, and we can see how they're surrounded by the works, and particularly south of Euston Road, of which there is no effective assessment, was the Gordon Street construction site, about which you will hear in due course. 5, procurement timing. I've outlined that briefly. Mr Farley, any comment to add to that?

462. MR FARLEY: One of the observations we've had of this, is it's a very new technique in effect that it has been to apply, which I think is excellent, where they're going to be having a lead construction involvement, with the designer and the contractor taking responsibility for the design from a very early stage in the project. One of the things that would normally happen, though, in a contract, is that the designer would spend quite a bit of time gathering the requirements in order to make sure the specification is very, very tight. So as it gets developed and designed fully, then he fully understands all the requirements of the area. With an ECI approach of contract – contract involvement, sorry – that doesn't necessarily happen automatically. So what needs to happen with this type of project, is the undertaker needs to be very clear about how that is going to happen, how the contractor is going to be making sure that the requirements of the properties is fully taken into account as he develops his design.

463. MR PURCHAS QC: Does that include the sort of engineering techniques which

have been referred to?

464. MR FARLEY: Very much so, yes.

465. MR PURCHAS QC: Slide 11, please. Top down, Mr Farley. Over to you.

466. MR FARLEY: Sir, we've looked at alternatives, and as Mr Bottomley recalls at Limehouse link, we built a very similar tunnel. This is a very similar technique to the one used there. Now, this isn't the only way we've been doing it, but this is a way of doing it.

467. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: With diaphragm walling.

468. MR FARLEY: With diaphragm walling, with a top-slab construction, and as the scheme gets built, intermediate slabs to support the –

469. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: The House of Commons car park was built in a roughly similar way.

470. MR FARLEY: Yes. Quite a common technique that's used. The benefit of the technique is that once you've put the roof slab on, a lot of the work takes place underneath, and therefore it reduces the amount of noise, dust and disturbance caused to the area in general. So it doesn't mean it gets away with everything – none whatsoever – but it does significantly reduce the impact of it. And from my experience, it doesn't take any longer to construct. Further benefits – this would also mean that transportation will –

471. CHAIR: We've got the point –

472. MR PURCHAS QC: One point, if I may. Materials and – clarify rail?

473. MR FARLEY: The site – it is organised appropriately with the National Temperance Hospital in main site of the bank. All material can be taken away very easily, using this technique, and then that would aid transportation.

474. MR PURCHAS QC: Sorry to interrupt you, just on that. Can we go to slide 12?

475. MR FARLEY: Slide 12, we can almost buzz on.

476. CHAIR: We can. Buzz on.

477. MR PURCHAS QC: I just want to be clear on this – on those projects you were involved with, any implication for cost appropriate?

478. MR FARLEY: Not that I'm aware of. In particular, I took full control of the development of the design for the Heathrow Terminal 2B.

479. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: That wasn't the bit that collapsed?

480. MR FARLEY: It wasn't the bit that collapsed.

481. MR PURCHAS QC: Touché.

482. MR FARLEY: And so I was very involved in developing both the design and the cost for it, and we costed it both ways, and it came out equal.

483. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you. Benefits on slide 13, containment plainly of dust and noise, and to a degree, vibration. Is that right?

484. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Can we assume – we'll read that.

485. MR PURCHAS QC: Okay. I was going to go on to 16.

486. MR FARLEY: Sir, we have also looked at the end works. It's a very complex amount of work to –

487. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: This includes the link to Euston Square?

488. MR FARLEY: This particular part of it is more the ticket hall. We'll come on to the link to Euston Square, which is actually a lot more complex. One of the aspects of this that I, in particular, was quite concerned about, was if we changed the method of construction for the works that approached it, was this still going to be viable, but I insist on intending it is. So it's very viable to still build it within the existing car park. What is interesting to note is that from the existing car park, there is a lot of work to go underground to get in to create new escalators and new passage ways into the existing underground system. That will become particular to note when we start talking about Cobourg Street.

489. MR PURCHAS QC: Now, let's go straight onto 18, please.

490. MR FARLEY: 18. The utilities works here are considerable. When we look at the four main utilities that need diverting out of the way of the tunnel works, there is 132 KV cable to be diverted, which takes a few years to do, taking it out of the way of the site. There's one half meter diameter Thames water sewer, which is a very large sewer, you can almost walk through it – and a 42 inch water main, which is one of the largest water mains in London, very strategic, and there's also a key part of the Fleet sewer down Euston road. Now on top of that, there are a further 10 utilities in Milton Street to be diverted in Euston road itself. So there is a considerable amount of diversion works on the right-hand side of –

491. MR PURCHAS QC: Euston Road was a particular centre of work for eight years, right? And Gordon Street, Milton Street and Regnart Buildings, all over periods of years, is that right?

492. MR FARLEY: That's correct.

493. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you. Then can we go on, please, to 21.

494. MR FARLEY: There is a gas diversion, but it actually doesn't affect our petitions.

495. MR PURCHAS QC: 21. This is Wilson House – the vent shaft alongside metric circle – 10 –

496. CHAIR: What do you want to see done? The least possible disturbance, and also both dust, and noise, and presumably, moving out the stuff?

497. MR MOULD QC (DfT): And a specific plan for the specific premises.

498. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: That's understandable. We went through some of that for the demolition of the Royal Mail parcel office, opposite the old St Pancras Church. So we're familiar with the needs there.

499. MR PURCHAS QC: One point, if I may – you may not have heard this – so far as crushing of materials, and the overall technique, what do you say on that?

500. MR FARLEY: So a technique is to bring it to one central location, because it's very efficient to do, but looking at the site, if something such as the Ibis Hotel had part of its wall retained, and the crushing would take place there. That would then contain considerably the noise –

501. MR PURCHAS QC: 23.

502. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: I admire the way you've made 19 vanish. Very appropriate for the magic circle.

503. MR PURCHAS QC: Not deliberate, I fear. Yes.

504. MR FARLEY: So we come onto the works now, actually in Euston road. These are very significant works in one of the most important roads in London.

505. MR PURCHAS QC: And just so we're clear, this clearly directly impinges on things like ground-borne noise, vibration, and other aspects that Mr Clerk will be referring to.

506. MR FARLEY: It does. The escalations are up to 8 meters deep for the construction of the connections to the existing Metropolitan Line, where there is, from the end of the platform that exists between the Metropolitan Line, a ramp to be created, which goes up to the subway which crosses Euston Road in the area of Gordon Street, through to the new ticket hall. In order to do that, there's four phases of utilities works, which means that the road gets restricted to two lanes each way, and moves across in four stages. It then repeats itself –

507. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Can you remind us which is the Society of Friends and which is Wellcome and which is...?

508. MR FARLEY: So Society of Friends is the top right-hand building.

509. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Yes.

510. MR FARLEY: The Wellcome building is straight down below it, and then the Guild building's below that. The Royal College of GPs are over on the left.

511. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: The north side?

512. MR FARLEY: Yes.

513. MR PURCHAS QC: And, Sir Peter, Draycott House is part of the Friends' property.

514. MR FARLEY: So the utilities, 17 utilities we talked about earlier, are the first activity to be diverted, and I presume, it's to put them in the middle of the road so that then the subway activity and the ramps can take place. In order to build the subway, that's built by using a series of bridges to take the traffic across where the subway goes. In addition there is the work to be done in Gordon Street itself, in between the two buildings.

515. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Is it effectively cut and cover?

516. MR FARLEY: It is effectively cut and cover, and talking earlier today with High Speed 2 I think they're still developing their plans for exactly how this takes place. It's a very, very complex piece of activity. The key point here though is that all this work is going to be taking place for up to 8-10 years, on a TfL road, which is immediately in front of all the people as you mentioned. In addition, it's extremely close to their buildings, so ground-born vibration and the like is bound to be causing disturbance to their auditorium in the basement.

517. MR PURCHAS QC: Just to be clear on that, both north and south of Euston Road, we've got our clients' premises, is that right?

518. MR FARLEY: That's correct.

519. MR PURCHAS QC: And then they have storage and archives in cellars, under the pavements either side?

520. MR FARLEY: Indeed.

521. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you. You've also raised flooding. I think we can go on please to (24)? These are the sort of requirements you'd be looking for, is that right?

522. MR FARLEY: Yes, we've been looking at solutions to this, and it's very difficult to develop solutions when the design itself is fairly immature, but there are a lot of techniques to reduce vibration, by using what's a piling system, where piles are pushed

in –

523. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: We've had that several times.

524. MR FARLEY: Thank you. But also, it would appear appropriate wherever possible to be doing all the works at the same time, rather than lots of different phases, and moving the traffic around. So, longer disturbance in one location to be able to put in the utility diversions and to be putting in the subway works, for instance, would seem appropriate to do. So, an exact answer for this at the moment is very difficult to be able to assess, but it does seem that with the planning it should be able to be produced a lot quicker?

525. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: And shouldn't cost more?

526. MR FARLEY: And should not cost more, no.

527. MR PURCHAS QC: And just one last point, from what end would you look to construct the subway? From the station end or from the Gordon Street –

528. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: You've got two stations –

529. MR PURCHAS QC: You have –

530. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: But you've got two London Underground stations here –

531. MR FARLEY: From the ticket hall or from the Gordon Street...?

532. MR PURCHAS QC: Yes.

533. MR FARLEY: I would say most of these works should be from the ticket hall end, taking those materials to the largest –

534. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Is that because you've got the car park available for –

535. MR FARLEY: It's the car park and the –

536. MR PURCHAS QC: (26)?



537. MR FARLEY: So Cobalt Street ventilation shaft. This, as you can see from the plan, is surrounded by the properties, these are the petitioner's properties. It's a very significant shaft for London Underground; it's necessary for ventilation and for emergency escape, so it's got some really key issues. It has a substation to be built within it, which I presume is more than just to be able to power the local equipment, it will be taking power down below. And in the end, it could be up to 20 metres high, so it's quite a significant –

538. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Sorry, 20 metres, not above ground?

539. MR FARLEY: Above ground level.

540. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Above ground level?

541. MR FARLEY: Yes.

542. MR PURCHAS QC: Let's go below ground?

543. MR FARLEY: If we go below ground, there's then a shaft to be built that doesn't just go vertically down; it also has to come across to meet the existing passageways, which actually go underneath part of the new mainline railway station. They go down about 20 metres, to meet the Northern Line, so it's a very large and deep shaft to be built below the ground. Some of those roads, in order to build that work, that is likely to be 24/7 operation, as once you start digging below the ground as you're well aware, you've got to keep going to keep it supported.

544. MR PURCHAS QC: Right, and (29)?

545. MR FARLEY: So what I've looked at here are methods that could be used in order to be able to reduce the impact of much of this. Digging a large, open shaft 24 hours a day, seven days a week, is quite a disturbing thing to the local people. So it seems appropriate actually that the building that's there stay in place, and the excavation take place from within existing basement. That could then create the shaft in the enclosed environment, which would be reducing the amount of disturbance locally, and also as far as the tunnelling activities are concerned, make it easier because of protection from the weather. This is actually very similar to the technique that will be used to create the passageways and connections underneath the new ticket hall. So it's actually

using the same technique, that's going to be applied in another part of the works.

546. MR PURCHAS QC: You also refer to Jubilee Line and Crossrail?

547. MR FARLEY: It has been used on other projects as well, so it seems very appropriate for the same technique to be used here. The other idea, as well, is that if you start taking that existing basements, those basements obviously are supporting a lot of the ground around them, including the ground for the Magic Circle and the likes. Those basements could easily stay in place and be cast against and form the new walls of the works that need to be below ground. Again, that's a technique that's used quite commonly now in many new buildings in London.

548. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: When they rebuilt Westminster tube station, they put the District and Circle Line, in a box. Did they then go beneath that to dig out the Jubilee Line?

549. MR FARLEY: We did, yes. I was on that project as well. But that's quite a different task.

550. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: I understand that –

551. MR FARLEY: Hold up the District and Circle Lines as well.

552. MR PURCHAS QC: But what you want to do is make sure that they consider these techniques, principally?

553. MR FARLEY: Absolutely, yes. I'm not saying these are the answers; these are things to be considered.

554. MR PURCHAS QC: Then we can go on to (31)?

555. MR FARLEY: So (31) is a concern for the Magic Circle in particular, it's the dot, the public auditorium in the upper levels, and were that crane to collapse on the building, such as happened at the Cabinet Office, it would be rather embarrassing. But more than that, it could be dangerous.

556. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: So is your spelling!

557. MR FARLEY: Sorry. So the appropriate standard appears to be to use the one

that Network Rail uses, and effectively what they would use for something like this would be only to allow the crane to over sail at the time when it needs to in the wind, but more importantly, actually make it a lot heavier-duty crane, so it's less likely to collapse.

558. MR PURCHAS QC: And the standards are readily available, an example of Network Rail is that right?

559. MR FARLEY: Absolutely, it's common practice.

560. MR CLIFTON-BROWN: We're not expert civil engineers. The thing is, surely, that you ought to be talking to HS2 about this, and that's really what this committee should be concerned about. We shouldn't be trying to adjudicate what is the correct civil engineering method, one over another. We're not qualified or capable of doing that. So are you in discussion with HS2 and do we need to know about all of this?

561. MR FARLEY: We have been as of this afternoon.

562. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: But this is your last page before you get onto the asks, so I think we're close?

563. MR PURCHAS QC: Yes, I can deal with that point later? Can we go to (38)?

564. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: But just going back to the crane, a crane that's good enough for the Magic Circle is a crane that ought to be good enough for anywhere else. There's nothing special about the Magic Circle that deserves protection from light cranes –

565. MR PURCHAS QC: The particular point is the public use of the theatre. That is –

566. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: There aren't many empty buildings over which cranes over sail.

567. MR PURCHAS QC: The distinction that Network Rail likes to make, these are public assets. I think the committee has the point. Can we go to (38) please?

568. MR FARLEY: This is in relation to site compounds. As always, the site is very

restrained and a lot of compounds. The primary compound is the National Temperance Hospital for this area, a large part of that currently is taken up with offices where at present, there's planned to be 1,025 people in that office, most of whom are not related to the day-to-day construction. An office of that size, which at the moment is intended to be six storeys tall, would be in the order of 100 metres long by 20 metres wide: so it would take up getting on for half the space. What it seems appropriate to us to do, is that should be relocated to somewhere else, and that site should be used as a primary construction site, for the logistics and building works, rather than actually for people. That would then mean that other sites throughout the area could actually be more efficiently used.

569. The next one I talk about is Cobourg Street. Cobourg Street, there's a compound that you can see replacing, effectively, 10 Melton Street. That only occurs in the second phase, but it is adjacent to the Royal College of GPs. There will not be something there when the scheme is finally built, and what seems more appropriate is that that is actually put in what will become part of the over-site development, and relocated accordingly.

570. The third one I'd like to mention is Gordon Street. Gordon Street, at the moment, there are two phases of activity. The first is to go and do works on the utilities; the second is to go and construct the subway works. But there's a break of about three years in between, and at the moment, it's listed to be used for the storage of materials. Three years is a long time to be using a site in the middle of a public area, for storage of materials, which don't directly relate to any of the works taking place in that area. Again, what we would see as appropriate is that for that period, it's returned to public use, and then re-opened as a work site as and when it needs to be.

571. MR PURCHAS QC: Can I just take you back very briefly to the National Temperance Hospital, my understanding – that's a hectare in size is it? Thank you. And of that, about half is devoted for 1,025 who are administrative offices, is that right?

572. MR FARLEY: Senior staff.

573. MR PURCHAS QC: Senior staff?

574. MR FARLEY: But not site related.

575. MR PURCHAS QC: There's another complex which is going to be used for actual building administration, which isn't on the podium is that right?

576. MR FARLEY: The podium building, according to the Environmental Statement, is somewhere that will house about 690 construction staff, many of whom are also workforce, so that would be directly related with the works itself.

577. MR PURCHAS QC: So taking those 1,025, do they have to be at Euston at all?

578. MR FARLEY: Very good question: I don't know exactly the function of them, but looking at the list of what they are intended to be there for, it doesn't appear to be. There are other projects now which are relocating people into offices, such as Thames Tideway Tunnel, have done that with all of their equipment teams.

579. MR PURCHAS QC: That's a similar size in terms of administration?

580. MR FARLEY: Very similar size.

581. MR PURCHAS QC: Alright, finally please, back to (32) if I may? I think the only thing I want to ask you about this is the reference to Thames Tideway?

582. MR FARLEY: So that's in relation to Code of Construction Practice Part A and Part B. The current Code of Construction Practice is a single one for the whole of the line. Thames Tideway and others, similarly, have brought in two parts: the first part to be throughout the whole of the scheme, the second part to be much more local and looking at the particular affected area. So Part B, here, for instance, would be the equivalent of looking at Euston Station. The benefit of the Part B is that it can impose particular restrictions and address particular concerns of the local properties, and is extremely good vehicle for making sure the best practicable means gets applied throughout the design process, as well as for the implementation process.

583. MR PURCHAS QC: Lovely. Right, Mr Farley unless there's anything else?

584. MR FARLEY: No.

585. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you very much indeed.

586. MR FARLEY: Thank you very much.

587. MR PURCHAS QC: I call Mr Clarke?

588. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Remind us how many witnesses more you have? Mr Clarke and how many?

589. MR PURCHAS QC: I've got the three more experts, including Mr Clarke. David Clarke, you've given evidence earlier, the committee will recall. They will have your qualifications and experience, over some 26 years is that right?

590. MR CLARKE: Correct. Can we have slide A1800(14) please? On this slide, you've shown airborne and ground-borne noise and vibration? Can you just explain the basis for those and why you've shown them?

591. MR CLARKE: These are just taken out of the existing HS2 documentation to show the limits that they have identified in their own documentation where some of those effects will start to happen for those three different items.

592. MR PURCHAS QC: And so far as these are levels for sensitive properties, for non-residential use –

593. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Sorry, this is HS2-caused noise is it?

594. MR CLARKE: Yes.

595. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Which are lower than the ambient noise levels?

596. MR CLARKE: Yes, these are the ones, if you look through the documents like E23 and the Code of Construction Practice, these are the tables which say, once you get to these levels, there is a potential for impact, adverse impact, based on noise and vibration from the works.

597. MR PURCHAS QC: And you give the source of them in the notes below is that right?

598. MR CLARKE: Correct, yes.

599. MR PURCHAS QC: If we look at the asterisk, airborne noise, that comes from Table 2 in E23, right?

600. MR CLARKE: Yes.

601. MR PURCHAS QC: If we look at vibration, again, that comes in table 4 in E23? But ground-borne noise, there's no standard for non-residential properties in E23, is that right?

602. MR CLARKE: That is correct.

603. MR PURCHAS QC: So you've gone back to the ES and, same as the Crossrail level, and you've set out the values that were given in the appendix of the ES, albeit they're not taken anywhere from that is that right?

604. MR CLARKE: Yes.

605. MR PURCHAS QC: Okay, fine. Thank you. So far as sensitivity is concerned, we're dealing here with ophthalmic surgery, general practitioner examinations, research –

606. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Can I just interrupt you for a second? Can you just look quickly at P12812(2)? That shows existing baseline sound levels? Which are generally higher than the last thing we're looking at?

607. MR CLARKE: Yes.

608. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Back to you?

609. MR CLARKE: For the airborne noise, correct, yes.

610. MR PURCHAS QC: In terms of sensitivity, what are the uses we're concerned with here?

611. MR CLARKE: Generally all the properties we're looking at have within the premises very sensitive, unusually sensitive often, some are similar to residential, such as the hotels and the student accommodation. Some are at least as sensitive; some are more. The auditorium in the Magic Circle will be more sensitive than residential, examination rooms, likewise.

612. MR PURCHAS QC: And matters like training for eye surgery?

613. MR CLARKE: Yes.

614. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you, and just to be clear about it, in the ES, apart from Magic Circle and Wesley, which is a hotel, they're all treated as offices, is that right?

615. MR CLARKE: They're all classified as offices, yes.

616. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you very much indeed. Just looking at these three sources, airborne noise, ground-borne noise and vibration, the character of works Mr Farley has described, where would you expect – or which would you expect to be the most intrusive?

617. MR CLARKE: Well, it's difficult to say. The vibration in some periods is in some periods by far and away, the worst. But equally, the airborne noise or some particular elements is particularly bad levels, 20dB or more above what could be tolerated by these buildings. So, across the board, in all honesty, all three of them could be a significant issue.

618. MR PURCHAS QC: So ground-borne noise as well?

619. MR CLARKE: Yes.

620. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you very much.

621. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Is there ground-borne noise from the existing Underground stations – lines, sorry?

622. MR CLARKE: Yes, you can hear the trains in many of the buildings, which indicates that ground-borne noise is certainly an issue and a potential issue; these buildings are vulnerable to that. It should be appreciated – I don't know if you ever noticed, but if you're in a building, you can often hear the vibration, if that's the right way to put it, before you can feel it. So just saying, 'It's got to be low enough so you can't feel the vibration too much' doesn't preclude ground-borne noise being a serious issue.

623. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Indeed, all I'm really trying to establish is that a number of these buildings, and their sensitive uses, already experience some degree of



ground-borne vibration?

624. MR CLARKE: Some degree, yes.

625. MR PURCHAS QC: There is a point, I think, on, for instance, General Practitioners. Do you know where you hear the Tube?

626. MR CLARKE: You can certainly hear it in the auditorium, which is close to the Euston Road, and likewise – I mean, with most of the buildings, it tends to be in the basements. That's usually where you can hear the vibration, but you can hear it slightly higher up in some of the buildings.

627. MR PURCHAS QC: So we're clear about it, there's been no assessment at all of ground-borne noise?

628. MR CLARKE: Not within the Environmental Statement at all. It's been recognised as a criteria, and there are occasional statements saying it might be an issue, but I can find not one single assessment of any ground-borne noise anywhere.

629. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: And none of the petitioners have given us an assessment of existing noise either?

630. MR PURCHAS QC: Your comment on that, Mr Clarke?

631. MR CLARKE: Not specifically, although the levels of vibration that are being talked about are almost – no, I will say, are going to cause significant levels of ground-borne noise. It doesn't take too much to work out the two.

632. MR PURCHAS QC: Indeed, but taking Sir Peter's question, from the evidence that is produced on the predictions by HS2, what do you say as to the likelihood of ground-borne noise affecting the properties?

633. MR CLARKE: I say during the periods of high vibration that are identified, that ground-borne noise will be also a significant problem and will pervade further than vibration.

634. MR PURCHAS QC: Right, thank you. Now, I've described the position on assurances as far as it goes, and what we have is the criteria now, are to be the subject of

specific assessment for individual properties?

635. MR CLARKE: Correct.

636. MR PURCHAS QC: On tables 2 and 4? Do you want to make a comment on the levels in 2 and 4, as appropriate or inappropriate for assessing sensitive uses of the kind we're concerned with?

637. MR CLARKE: Well it's a good starting point. I would say that table 4 is appropriate; the vibration limits are very sensible, and at present there is minimal, if any, vibration in this particular area, 'feel-able' vibration. I absolutely take Sir Peter Bottomley's point, that the airborne noise limits given in table 2 are on the low side, and already most of the buildings in this area have got some degree of enhancement to their facades to enable them to cope with the high levels with it. I think it would be certainly churlish to say, sorry, you've got to do it over those. But, these levels: 50, 55, 60, are probably a little low. We know that the noise levels there, 55-65, and certainly those buildings will take that, as we will come on shortly, the noise levels being predicted by HS2 in many cases, are up around the 90dB which these buildings will not be able to sustain.

638. MR PURCHAS QC: What about the ten-hour Leq for daytime noise, any comment on that?

639. MR CLARKE: Well, the main issue with the ten-hour Leq is that obviously that's an average over the whole day and it could be that the contractor chooses to do a particularly noisy activity for an hour or so, and then do lots of quiet ones, so the noise level not only could be for the daytime, for the whole daytime could be 90dB. It could potentially be 100dB for a short period, so that is another serious risk. You might – well, we can't design the buildings to be protected against 90dB, let alone 100dB. So that is – the ten-hour Leq is a potential problem.

640. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: 90dB is getting pretty close to dancing with a pneumatic drill isn't it?

641. MR CLARKE: Well, absolutely. I know that you've probably heard already about the noise at work situation here. If it's 90dB at the facades of these buildings,

these sites are going to be dreadful, and they should be controlling noise just to deal with health and safety –

642. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Prime Minister's Question Time with Margaret Thatcher was 93dB.

643. MR PURCHAS QC: But just so we're clear, in short, does one need to have individual assessment of the particular building and the sensitive uses?

644. MR CLARKE: Yes. Each building in this particular area is unique; it has its own façade, its own level of sound insulation, ranging from the Royal Asiatic which is very poor, single glazing sash windows, no ventilation other than natural ventilation; right up to the Wesley Hotel, which has secondary glazing and therefore a reasonable degree of protection, certainly to deal with the noise levels, the 65dB which are currently up there. But clearly each building has its own use, its own internal noise and vibration tolerant levels and their own structures. Therefore, yes, it must be done on an individual basis.

645. MR PURCHAS QC: (16) please? You've extracts here from the Environmental Assessment. As you point out, there's no assessment of ground-borne noise. Is there any assessment in Gordon Street at all?

646. MR CLARKE: None whatsoever.

647. MR PURCHAS QC: Euston Road, with the kind of activities that Mr Farley has described, is there any vibration assessment relevant to this part of Euston Road?

648. MR CLARKE: None whatsoever.

649. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you. You comment here, under the table, on the inconsistency between certain of the readings or years shown. What are you referring to there?

650. MR CLARKE: Well, particularly the bottom two, the Magic Circle and the Wesley Hotel, the assessment points are almost yards from each other, and yet the Wesley Hotel is being reported as being a significant effect for four years; yet 10 yards across the street, it's for two years. It just seems incongruous and incompatible that those two could not possibly drop off in such a short distance, so it seems odd and

difficult to understand where all the different lengths of time come from.

651. MR PURCHAS QC: And so we're clear about it, as Mr Farley explained, this is going to involve significant work for many years?

652. MR CLARKE: Many years, yes.

653. MR PURCHAS QC: If we go on to (18) please? When we compare those to the levels of vibration dose or indeed, the 65 or 70, one can see the levels shown by HS2, well above those levels, right?

654. MR CLARKE: Yes, the circles with the numbers in are the typical ambient noise level that is currently experienced in all those locations, and the numbers in the grey boxes relate to the specific predictions that have been taken out of the Environmental Statement, saying how loud it will be or how much vibration there'll be.

655. MR PURCHAS QC: With your experience, when you look at those sorts of levels predicted by HS2, how compatible is it with the kind of uses carried on in our clients' properties?

656. MR CLARKE: For the majority, it's completely incompatible. I would say 80, 90dB outside these building, they are not designed – cannot be designed to achieve acceptable levels.

657. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you. Go to (20) please? You've taken there vibration levels, is that right? Which are described as being trigger levels for protection, I think, in the Code of Construction Practice, is that right?

658. MR CLARKE: Yes, if you see on, say, the top line, there are two vertical lines –

659. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: The left?

660. MR CLARKE: The left-hand vertical line is the level taken from table 4 which shows the level at which there will be an impact; the right-hand line is the trigger level taken from the Code of Construction Practice and that is the level at which basically something has to happen.

661. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: You're able to make all this detail available to the

promoters aren't you?

662. MR CLARKE: Yes.

663. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: I think you're taking us slightly into more detail than we need.

664. MR CLARKE: The key there is, as you can see, that out of almost every building, the levels are well above what can be tolerated.

665. MR PURCHAS QC: What we're seeking is a trigger action plan for each of these premises?

666. MR CLARKE: Correct.

667. MR PURCHAS QC: That's the simple – like the other projects I referred to?

668. MR CLARKE: Yes, absolutely.

669. MR PURCHAS QC: Alright, that's fine, I think that speaks for itself. If we go on to (21), same exercise, but using – this is airborne noise, is that right?

670. MR CLARKE: Correct. As you can see, taking again, Sir Peter Bottomley's point, the third column shows the acceptable noise limits on a broad brush approach, I have seen what each building is likely to be able to tolerate. Generally it's between 60-70dB, not the 50-55dB.

671. MR PURCHAS QC: Just a comment please, if you would, on the Royal Asiatic Society, what is their position so far as the test levels you've adopted?

672. MR CLARKE: Well, as I say, the 60 there comes from the fact that this has very basic sound insulation: sash windows, and natural ventilation. So that building, to bring it up to be able to cope with the sorts of levels that everywhere else would be able to cope with, it does need some work doing to the building to start with.

673. MR PURCHAS QC: So you're going to need to do protection at the outset, to achieve these levels?

674. MR CLARKE: Yes.

675. MR PURCHAS QC: Good, then you've provided for the promoters in the visual assessments at each of the individual properties – and I'm not going to trouble the committee with those. Page (34) if we may? Essentially, you've set out here the approach; if we look in the third box down the table, it is that of assessment is it?

676. MR CLARKE: Yes.

677. MR PURCHAS QC: Then identifying what needs to be done as part of the works design and any mitigation, monitoring and then an action plan as to what is happened if it's exceeded, including if need be, further steps or re-accommodation is that right?

678. MR CLARKE: Ultimately, yes.

679. MR PURCHAS QC: That's a commitment that we ask, and not being provided?

680. MR CLARKE: That is correct.

681. MR PURCHAS QC: And you've dealt with how that compares with Victoria Station upgrade, Thames Tideway and also the Garden Bridge project?

682. MR CLARKE: Yes, which is just about starting. It is a very common practice to have a trigger action plan.

683. MR PURCHAS QC: Mr Clarke, thank you.

684. CHAIR: Mr Mould, do you want to –

685. MR MOULD QC (DfT): No, I didn't deal with the last –

686. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: I think – will be chiming in to ask questions or just talking?

687. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Well, I can just talk if you like?

688. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: I think in many cases, thank you!

689. MR MOULD QC (DfT): I won't talk very much.

690. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: He was your ante-penultimate witness I believe?

691. MR PURCHAS QC: Yes. I do call Mr Witchalls as to how we deal with transport? Please could we have slide A1769(37)? Thank you, Mr Witchalls, is set out your experience there. If we go straight on to (39)?

692. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Thames Tideway is the one that was supposed to start at £1 or £2 billion and is now going to be £3 or £4 or £5 billion?

693. MR PURCHAS QC: Not because of the top-down technique.

694. MR MOULD QC (DfT): It hasn't started yet, it might be worth noting.

695. MR PURCHAS QC: (39). You've shown there Endsleigh Gardens and Gower Place. Can you explain to the committee the point you want to draw attention to?

696. MR WITCHALLS: Yes, a couple of things here, really. Firstly, you can't see that these have realistically been assessed in the transport assessment in the Environmental Statement, in terms of potential impact. But the key point here is that Endsleigh Gardens is identified as a construction traffic route to the Gower Street compound, and you can see from that top right-hand side slide that actually – sorry, top-left hand slide, that actually the eastern end of Endsleigh Gardens at Upper Woburn Place is actually one-way, and westbound, away from you in that photograph, that has an eastbound contraflow cycle lane. It also has a large bank of cycle docking stations on that corner. So we're very concerned on behalf of Endsleigh Gardens that you'll be bringing HGV traffic along that route against people getting onto docking station bikes, out into the carriageway and people cycling towards those, lorries turning around the corner. In addition to that, related to that, is the analysis that HS2 have done, has shown that 28% of personal injury accidents in this area are cyclists, so there are great concerns.

697. MR PURCHAS QC: And just so we're clear about this, this goes alongside Friends House, doesn't it?

698. MR WITCHALLS: Absolutely, and Draycott House.

699. MR PURCHAS QC: Draycott House. And just if you help the committee with this, on the proposals that are being made, to use this as a route for the Gordon Street construction site, is that a two-way route to the construction site? How is it shown?

700. MR WITCHALLS: Endsleigh Gardens is plainly one way –

701. MR PURCHAS QC: At the moment, yes.

702. MR WITCHALLS: Now, on the plans in the promoter's documents, it's shown as a construction route; it's not shown specifically as a one-way route. Indeed, in table 67, page 190 of their transport assessment, they actually show that with Gordon Street closed, Endsleigh Gardens could be used eastbound along its whole length to get back onto the Euston Road, which would mean making it two-way, at that eastern end, as you see there. So making that a two-way route.

703. MR PURCHAS QC: It's also suggested as a taxi holding area, I think it's documented, is that right?

704. MR WITCHALLS: Yes, it's clearly shown as one of the temporary taxi rank area, the western end of Endsleigh Gardens being used as a taxi rank storage area, so those taxis can then turn right into Gordon Street and then go into the Euston Square West temporary taxi rank next to the station.

705. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you, and this also has disabled parking which we will come back to. (41) please? Just explain would you the asterisk?

706. MR WITCHALLS: Those asterisks are not mine; they are on the promoter's document. They're shown as the periods – or the specific times – that traffic impacts and traffic flows have been assessed.

707. MR PURCHAS QC: If one was looking at the lorry – the effect of lorries discharged onto this road from this construction project, how do these relate to the numbers of lorries being generated?

708. MR WITCHALLS: Well, clearly the bar charts, the up and down lines, are showing the peaks of HGV movement, and the stars in most cases, don't coincide with peaks of lorry or HGV movements. In fact, the AP3 line at the top represents the 800 daily movements that is predicted as the peak flow, so none of those assessed periods comes close to any of those peak levels.

709. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you. Now, in (43) please? The Camden assurance



covers Euro 6; I think the point you're raising is it should be an assurance that responds to any enhancement of that standard over the period of the works, is that the point?

710. MR WITCHALLS: Yes, it's very welcome that the Euro 6 requirement now applies to all construction HGVs, rather than just those taking excavated materials, as with the original. But we also think that Euro 6 requirements, should come in, 2020, but should track any requirement of TfL beyond 2020 for their ultra-low emissions zone.

711. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you, I can then take you to (47)? If I may, I don't try and take this shortly, originally taxis were not shown at all in the original scheme, south of Euston Road for holding or otherwise. It recently, as part of AP3, they're shown using Endsleigh Gardens, is that right? As a holding, standing area?

712. MR WITCHALLS: That's right, yes.

713. MR PURCHAS QC: I'm grateful. You regard that as unsuitable for a number of reasons: not least, Endsleigh Gardens, but also what about the junction through Gordon Street into Melton Street, and how suitable is that to have additional traffic placed on it?

714. MR WITCHALLS: Well that junction will be fairly significantly constrained by not only the Gordon Street compound but the works in Euston Road itself, and then a requirement for taxis to cross over temporary bridges, across Euston Road. So, it would certainly be quite a long way down the list of preferred designated routes for the main taxi entry points, of the station.

715. MR PURCHAS QC: You're not asking the committee to decide the taxi routes, what you are asking, we are included in the consultations as to the provisions that should be made, is that right?

716. MR WITCHALLS: Yes, we think we should be included alongside the likes of Camden, TfL and residents in those discussions.

717. MR PURCHAS QC: (48) please? I mention this question of the cul-de-sacs that are created in Stephenson Way and Euston Street. Can you see any reason why a turning provision should be made at the end of those cul-de-sacs?

718. MR WITCHALLS: Well, from the point of view of access to properties, there

needs to be some mechanism of getting deliveries in and out of those roads.

719. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: You either reverse in, or reverse out, or having a turning place?

720. MR WITCHALLS: Yes, absolutely. But what's been maybe overlooked is those are one-way streets at the moment, so clearly they need to be changed into two-way streets to achieve that.

721. MR PURCHAS QC: Just think about Sir Peter's point about reversing out of those roads, down the whole length: what do you say about the acceptability of using those roads and the access onto them, the student premises at Bentley House, the disabled spaces. How satisfactory is that?

722. MR WITCHALLS: Well, clearly it's undesirable: you're introducing another layer of risk and it would need to be carefully managed and controlled over such a long distance.

723. MR PURCHAS QC: Alright, can we go onto (49) please? That is the concern with compound management and construction traffic which you've already referred to, is that right? The Garden...?

724. MR WITCHALLS: Yes, and the point there is, we don't really see any reason why the Gordon Street compound can't be accessed simply from Euston Road.

725. MR PURCHAS QC: And then slide (50), disabled spaces, I think there's two in Stephenson Way and three in Endsleigh Gardens, is that right?

726. MR WITCHALLS: Yes, that's right.

727. MR PURCHAS QC: And if they are to be lost, then they should be replaced and signed, right?

728. MR WITCHALLS: Absolutely.

729. MR PURCHAS QC: I'm very grateful, thank you very much Mr Witchalls. Are you happy?

730. MR MOULD QC (DfT): I'm going to do what I've been – speak briefly at the

end.

731. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you. Dr Edmunds, if I may? Slide (51)

732. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Doctor of...?

733. DR EDMUNDS: Geomorphology and hydrogeology.

734. MR PURCHAS QC: I have got a list of qualifications which aren't on the slide, but you're a very experienced –

735. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: He's a scientist.

736. MR PURCHAS QC: Scientist, yes. (52), yes. Information is shown here. Where does it come from?

737. DR EDMUNDS: It's basically information, contained within the London Borough of Camden's strategic flood risk assessment, published in July 2014, talks to you about –

738. MR PURCHAS QC: And the site of the information plainly includes the station box, I think is that right?

739. DR EDMUNDS: Yes, that's correct, yes. The petitioner's building and station box, yes.

740. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you, and just tell us what relevance there is in that drawing to the issue of flooding so far as the committee are concerned?

741. DR EDMUNDS: Well, I think in the Environmental Statement, it does not show information concerning groundwater flow directions or the interactions between the natural geology sequence and the thickness of main ground that covers the surface, which is typically about three metres in the area, in showing how water will move. The groundwater, surface water interaction in that area.

742. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you, now if one looks at that, is this an area that is likely to be prone to groundwater effects in terms of planting or otherwise?

743. DR EDMUNDS: Well, certainly by the indicated groundwater flow direction, at

the moment it's fairly constrained around buildings and basements through the area, and by bringing the curtilage of the station closer to the petitioner's buildings, it restricts the flow even more.

744. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you. We can go on to (53) please? Does this come from the same source, the Camden strategic flood risk assessment?

745. DR EDMUNDS: That's correct, yes.

746. MR PURCHAS QC: It identifies high risk and medium risk and others, from risk of flooding is that right?

747. DR EDMUNDS: Yes, that's correct, yes.

748. MR PURCHAS QC: And there is shown in the area – those areas include Stephenson Way and Draycott Buildings, is that right?

749. DR EDMUNDS: Yes, there are some area of surface water flooding at risk in those areas.

750. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you very much indeed. On (54) please? Again, information came from the same source, is that right?

751. DR EDMUNDS: That's correct, yes.

752. MR PURCHAS QC: It shows areas of increased susceptibility of elevated ground water, and they're largely coincident with areas where the infiltration, south infiltration constraints are very significant, is that right?

753. DR EDMUNDS: Yes, it serves a dual purpose.

754. MR PURCHAS QC: And just so I'm clear about it, the station box here is imposed on this information. How does the area under it relate to this area of elevated ground water and increased, very significant, constraint on infiltration?

755. DR EDMUNDS: Yes, the new station footprint is pretty much under laid by an orange colouration.

756. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you. You've shown area red, EA groundwater flood

incident, is that unique in Camden, or what is the position?

757. DR EDMUNDS: No, the Camden study appears to show, circa 25 such incidents across the Borough.

758. MR PURCHAS QC: What does the assessment carried out by HS2 say about groundwater flooding and the question of incidents?

759. DR EDMUNDS: I believe the studies suggested there aren't any such incidents?

760. MR PURCHAS QC: None recorded?

761. DR EDMUNDS: None recorded.

762. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you very much indeed. Again, what is the implication that you draw from this information as to the risk of flooding in this area?

763. DR EDMUNDS: Well, attention has been drawn by various sources that this is an area that is clearly constrained in terms of movement of groundwater and by putting the station where it is, surrounding the petitioner's buildings, it will only make the flow of groundwater through the area more difficult.

764. MR PURCHAS QC: So if we go to (56), this is a comment on the note produced by HS2 in response to our concerns for flooding. Your comment, the third bullet point, 'Investigation of the ground, south-west side of the station needs to be carried out asap so that the results can be fed into the design stage'. Why are you saying that?

765. DR EDMUNDS: Well, I think at the moment there's no substantive detail as to what the characteristics of the ground are, or indeed, what water levels are in the area and also how they change through time. So the sooner a baseline information can be gathered, the better the sense of understanding of the problems that may afflict the area can be appreciated.

766. MR PURCHAS QC: And how does one address a problem of groundwater flooding created by a structure such as the station box?

767. DR EDMUNDS: Well I think first of all it's understanding of what water sort of goes into that direction and seeing what volume of water may be involved; and various

mitigation measures could then be considered.

768. MR PURCHAS QC: What sort of things might be considered?

769. DR EDMUNDS: For example, perhaps preferential pathways for, perhaps, trenches to go around the buildings or pump systems that relate to certain levels.

770. MR PURCHAS QC: Is that relating to the station box or more?

771. DR EDMUNDS: It's relating to the station box and you could use pump systems with the buildings as well.

772. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you. Let's go on please to (58)? This is a system you're looking for in terms of what is required here. If we look at the right-hand column, control of water around the retaining wall margin, and build into a sustainable drainage system is that right?

773. DR EDMUNDS: Yes, that would be the way forward, although as was pointed out in the previous slide, there are problems with installing studs in that area.

774. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you, and you refer to artesian wells here as well, what's that referring to?

775. DR EDMUNDS: There's a well at the rear of the Wellcome Trust building, which is believed to be artesian, it goes down to the chalk aquifer and it would be necessary to try and protect that from any problems.

776. MR PURCHAS QC: We'll come on to (61) please, it should be provided? It's right that a number of the basements of the premises we're concerned with here don't have tanking, is that right?

777. DR EDMUNDS: Yes, there are a couple of premises which are more modern in construction or refurbishment, therefore they're tanked. Others are, either un-tanked or of uncertain integrity of tanking.

778. MR PURCHAS QC: Where they have storage?

779. DR EDMUNDS: Yes, exactly yes.

780. MR PURCHAS QC: So what we're looking for here is water management, is an early assessment and design of a passive system, including design of the HS2 works, is that right?

781. DR EDMUNDS: That's correct, yes.

782. MR PURCHAS QC: Monitoring with undertakings, as to operation and maintenance, and then finally, steps to be taken if it proves not to be achieved, is that right?

783. DR EDMUNDS: That's correct, yes.

784. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you very much indeed. We also ask that it should include consultation of our clients, is that right?

785. DR EDMUNDS: That's correct, yes.

786. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you very much. I'm very grateful, Dr Edmunds. There are no questions.

787. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: We often hear about Doctor Who finding a salmon and sharing it with the Venerable Bede and the Fleet are we?

788. MR PURCHAS QC: I'm afraid I've passed my quarter-to-ten, but we should be through fairly soon! Thank you very much, I'm very grateful. Can I then just go to the individual witnesses if I may? Start with the Wellcome Trust, and can we have slide (37)? Introduce Simon Chaplin, you're a director of the Society and a member of the executive board, is that correct?

789. MR CHAPLIN: That's correct.

790. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you very much indeed. (37) describes the Wellcome Trust, it makes charitable contribution to medical and related –

791. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: We know the Wellcome Trust, one of the biggest charities, biggest arts organisation –

792. MR PURCHAS QC: Yes, very important, public significance. Page (40) please? Page (40), you've identified the buildings of the Trust in this area. Let's start with

number 10, which is the Wellcome Building. Tell us just a little bit about that?

793. MR CHAPLIN: The Wellcome Building is the Wellcome Trust's cultural foundation; it's open to the public, it stages exhibitions and events, including loans of materials from art galleries and museums around the world, receives 700,000 visits a year, in the current year. It also hosts a research library dedicated to understanding the history of medicine, which receives 40,000 visits a year. There's a conference centre in the basement, which supports the Trust's charitable objects and also makes a contribution to our funding.

794. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you, and of course, surrounded by the works, as we've heard from Mr Farley. Can we then – 11 is the Gibbs Building? I think largely that is concerned with administration? But can you tell us a little bit about the meetings that take place and the storage of artefacts?

795. MR CHAPLIN: So there's about 1,000 staff and tenants in the building, it receives about 200 visits per day, hosts international meetings related to the business of the Wellcome Trust. In the basement and sub-basement, we also have the library collection stored, so over 100,000 paintings, prints and drawings; and about 500,000 rare books and manuscripts on two levels.

796. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you very much. Bentley House on the other side of Euston Road is number 6, that's student accommodation, is that right?

797. MR CHAPLIN: That's correct.

798. MR PURCHAS QC: And that's between Stephenson Way obviously and Euston Road. The Institute of Ismaili Studies is number 7, right?

799. MR CHAPLIN: That's correct.

800. MR PURCHAS QC: And then you've also got residential flats at number 12 in North Gower Street, right?

801. MR CHAPLIN: Yes.

802. MR PURCHAS QC: If we go to (59) please? Thank you. You've set out the requests that are made; the promoter is well-familiar with those, but just help me with



this: what is your concern so far as ground-borne noise and vibration is involved?

803. MR CHAPLIN: There's an obvious impact on the business, particularly in Wellcome Collection, where we have conferences and also where we have the research library. But also, a concern over the impact on exhibitions and events. If we're wanting to exhibit material, we have to abide by quite stringent, both security and environmental conditions, and vibrations and risks to those.

804. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you very much indeed. Now, you've had a letter of assurance from the promoter, is that right? 11 December. Just so we're clear about it, you're seeking consultation, is that right?

805. MR CHAPLIN: Yes.

806. MR PURCHAS QC: You're seeking assessment on flooding, and consultation, as I explained in opening, right?

807. MR CHAPLIN: Correct.

808. MR PURCHAS QC: In addition to that, you have your concerns about settlement, which I referred to in opening, is that right?

809. MR CHAPLIN: Correct.

810. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you. There's also a question of notice of utility works. They're going to offer three months' notice has been given, is that satisfactory or acceptable as far as you're concerned?

811. MR CHAPLIN: For exhibition, for example, they're often planned a year to 18 months in advance; for other activities, they're normally a six month lead in period.

812. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you very much indeed. The other matters outstanding are those that I outlined in opening, is that right?

813. MR CHAPLIN: That's correct.

814. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you very much indeed. Good, thank you very much Mr Chaplin, unless there are any questions.

815. MR HENDRICK: How many more witnesses are you going to put up, Mr Purchas?

816. MR PURCHAS QC: I was going to call just on the individual concerns of each of the petitioner –

817. MR HENDRICK: The question asked for a number?

818. MR PURCHAS QC: I think six.

819. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Well, I think if the six can trot through quite fast, that will be very helpful.

820. CHAIR: We're thinking about a couple of minutes on each, really, if it's six?

821. MR PURCHAS QC: Yes, I will do that. Can I call Mr Paul Parker? If we can have slide (74)? Paul Parker, you're the recorded clerk for the Quakers and Chief Executive, is that right?

822. MR PARKER: That's right, I'm the recorded clerk – the closest the Quakers get to a chief executive.

823. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Will you treat this as a contemplative moment of silence before you speak?

824. MR PURCHAS QC: Well, that's the first point we were going to make, because it is very much – your services are involved with contemplation and silence, is that right? You have as you describe on this page, your particular concerns. Not only do you have your meetings and worship, but you also have library, archives, storage areas, and also facilities for conferences and matters of that kind, is that right?

825. MR PARKER: That's right, we're the national home of Quakers in Britain. I want you to imagine if you can, as MPs, a thousand people gathered in silence in a large space purpose built for the purpose, listening for divine guidance about whatever matters are before us. So we are particularly sensitive to intrusive noise. There's also a weekly meeting for worship on a number of days in the week in the building, as well as a conference business which generates income for our work.

826. MR PURCHAS QC: Elsewhere, you say there's somewhere in the order of 300,000 persons a year will be visiting your premises?

827. MR PARKER: That's right, the footfall of the building is very high.

828. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you. The concerns you have, I think, are self-explanatory to the committee. You're also very concerned about disabled parking and access?

829. MR PARKER: Absolutely, it's already inadequate, and we have a disproportionate number of elderly and disabled participants in our activities.

830. MR PURCHAS QC: Right, well I'm going to take you to page 73 if I may, because Drayton House is owned by you and you're responsible for it. But it's occupied by UCL is that right?

831. MR PARKER: Yes, that's correct

832. MR PURCHAS QC: And that's used for a range of their Economics Faculty lectures, examinations, studies, right?

833. MR PARKER: That's correct.

834. MR PURCHAS QC: Its only access and all servicing is from Gordon Street, right?

835. MR PARKER: In the photograph, we see some metal struts, what are they?

836. MR PURCHAS QC: They're props to prevent –

837. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Buttresses –

838. MR PARKER: Buttresses to protect the light well, which stands around the perimeter of the building.

839. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you very much indeed. Then on page (76), you set out your asks, which reflect the matters we've discussed already, including length of notice, is that right?

840. MR PARKER: That's right. We plan a number of our events well over a year ahead, obviously we're running a conference business which is sensitive to disruption.

841. MR PURCHAS QC: And in opening, I identified the broader issues, which you're concerned with?

842. MR PARKER: Yes.

843. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you very much, I'm grateful Mr Parker. I then call Dr Helen Stokes-Lampard, if I may and slide (78)? Dr Stokes-Lampard but you're also have a doctorate in medicine, is that right?

844. DR STOKES-LAMPARD: Yes I do.

845. MR PURCHAS QC: And you're obviously a Fellow of the Royal College and a practicing general practitioner is that right?

846. DR STOKES-LAMPARD: Indeed.

847. MR PURCHAS QC: You're leaving for an appointment tomorrow at 5.30, I think?

848. DR STOKES-LAMPARD: I am, for my first patient.

849. MR PURCHAS QC: Can we then on page (78), you've described the College, but of particular importance, if we go to page (80), the activities. I want you just to explain very briefly the role to the College in providing examinations for general practitioners in this country?

850. DR STOKES-LAMPARD: Certainly. Every single general practitioner who qualifies in the UK undertakes one vital element of their examinations within our building at 30 Euston Square. This is a simulated surgery whereby they will effectively see 14 patients just like a condensed GP surgery, so this is a unique facility, a unique examination and there is nothing like it anywhere else in the UK.

851. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you very much. Then, in terms of the conference centre at ground and basement, you describe the activities there, and it's both available for the Royal College Members but also for others, is that right?

852. DR STOKES-LAMPARD: That's correct, we derive commercial income from it as well as a vital resource for our members.

853. MR PURCHAS QC: Just help Sir Peter would you, you have archive storage under the pavements of Euston Road, do you hear Tubes down there?

854. DR STOKES-LAMPARD: We're aware of – yes, a very low-grade noise if you've very quiet and still; we're aware of that vibration.

855. MR PURCHAS QC: But it's not intrusive?

856. DR STOKES-LAMPARD: Not intrusive but we are aware of it.

857. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you very much. Study bedrooms on the third floor. What are they used for?

858. DR STOKES-LAMPARD: On the second and third floor, 41 study bedrooms which are used for accommodation purposes and for working, by examiners, members of the College on professional business, and any capacity then, we let out. We have an occupancy rate of 95% during the working week.

859. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you very much indeed. And you also have the Council rooms and other accommodation on the top floor?

860. DR STOKES-LAMPARD: Yes.

861. MR PURCHAS QC: Good, I'm going to straight to page (91)? Your concerns which are set out there: the committee can look through them. So far as the assurances are concerned, are they broadly similar to the ones I've described in opening?

862. DR STOKES-LAMPARD: They are. The biggest issue we're fearful of is that there's no point in having real time vibration or noise assessment. If you're in the middle of a once in a lifetime professional examination, if that examination is disturbed by some trigger alert, for the individual concerned, the examiners, it is useless, because the examination is suddenly null and void, thereby rendering the whole process incompatible with continuation, which would mean a whole review of the entire system and suspension of formal assessment for a very long time, until a new resource and a new centre could be purchase or identified, set up, and the whole thing moved. So real

time monitoring is not helpful; it's too late by the time it's real time.

863. MR PURCHAS QC: So that's why you need a specific assessment at the outset and designed properly at the beginning?

864. DR STOKES-LAMPARD: Please.

865. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you very much. Can I then call Richard Gladwell, please? Page (95)? Richard Gladwell, you are Vice President, I think, of the Magic Circle, is that right?

866. MR GLADWELL: Yes.

867. MR PURCHAS QC: We see on (95), it's very well known to the committee, the importance of this – what is actually an international organisation, is that right?

868. MR GLADWELL: Yes, very much so.

869. MR PURCHAS QC: I'm going to take you to (97)? Which describes what is within. Just working down the building, you have a theatre at the top, is that right?

870. MR GLADWELL: It seats 164, yes.

871. MR PURCHAS QC: Performance space in the floor below?

872. MR GLADWELL: Yes, the Devant Room can be used for all kinds of performance and presentations and dinner for 80.

873. MR PURCHAS QC: And you have a number of important artefacts and books, and they're stored with the library in the basement and also on display through the building, is that right?

874. MR GLADWELL: Yes, our collections are on display throughout the building; the most valuable things are kept safely in the basement. In that picture there, you might be able to see Sooty in the background; he lives down there. We also have more than one copy of Scot's *Discoverie of Witchcraft*, the very first book on magic.

875. MR PURCHAS QC: Right, if we go to page (100), please? This is what you say are successful but fragile finances. Would you just explain that concern to the

committee?

876. MR GLADWELL: We have made a great success in 12 Stephenson Way. The members get to meet there every Monday and enjoy lectures and shows, and examine new members. We can only afford to do so because we are also used for corporate and private hires – since the banks broke, much more public events – to be able to fund the building and stay there for our members as well.

877. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you. If you go to 101, your concerns, I'm sure the Committee are alive to, bearing the nature of the skills and activities which you continue, plainly that includes the demolition and works on the vent shaft immediately next door. Is that right?

878. MR GLADWELL: Absolutely.

879. MR PURCHAS QC: And are you looking for a specific plan to be produced in advance by HS2 or the nominated undertaker? Is that right.

880. MR GLADWELL: Yes.

881. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you. In addition to questions of noise, both airborne and ground-borne, and vibration. Is that right?

882. MR GLADWELL: Yes. All are of great concern to us.

883. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you. The crane, we've dealt with. And the additional concerns over flooding in the basement, and threat of settlement. Is that right?

884. MR GLADWELL: Yes. Fixing it afterwards is too late. It's not replacing carpets and sofas; these are irreplaceable collections.

885. MR PURCHAS QC: And your reputation is also critical to your success, is it?

886. MR GLADWELL: Yes. People have to want to come to our building. So, for us, for planning, for selling it, if it's not attractive to them for any reason, then people don't come and we don't survive. It's as simple as that.

887. MR PURCHAS QC: And what do you see about the three months' notice that's been offered of the works – the utility works?

888. MR GLADWELL: Well, we're surviving on selling tickets to public events that we were planning for; for example, the Christmas show, where 2,500 people come and see our shows over Christmas, goes on sale at Easter time. We can't change that at three months' notice. And if people are planning conferences, it's like booking weddings: people do that in a year in advance. We need much better planning.

889. MR PURCHAS QC: Alright. And you've set out your asks. Is there anything else you wanted to add?

890. MR GLADWELL: No.

891. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you very much indeed. Then I call Dr Ohta, please. Slide 104. Dr Alison Ohta, you're the Director of the Royal Asiatic Society. Is that right?

892. DR OHTA: Yes, I am.

893. MR PURCHAS QC: You've set out its background on page 104. If you go to 105, is this again an international organisation in the sense that it's liaising across the world with other similar societies?

894. DR OHTA: Yes, we have other branches of the Royal Asiatic Society in Asia. There are no formal connections between us but informal dialogue happens between each of the organisations.

895. MR PURCHAS QC: And in terms of sensitivity of the work and its vulnerability, what's your comment?

896. DR OHTA: Well, we are a very sensitive receptor, because most of our activities have to be carried out in quiet. We have lectures and seminars. We have a library which is visited by researchers from all over the world. And also we rent out the top floor – the third floor – to the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, who is a long-term tenant. And we also let out the lecture hall and the council room for classes to particularly UCL at the moment on a daily basis – so, that's from nine until six most days – and other organisations as well in the evening. And this is a very important income stream for us. It provides about 40% of our income and, without this, I'm afraid we'd find it very difficult to continue.



897. MR PURCHAS QC: And just tell us about flooding. Have you had any experience of that?

898. DR OHTA: We had a small amount of water ingress about a year and a half ago in the basement. The basement is where we keep our manuscripts, our archive books, our library of books, many of which are irreplaceable and extremely valuable. It was the result of rainwater, I think, through a hole that had been dug by Thames Water at the back of the building in Regnart Buildings. It was very difficult to determine the exact cause of it but, after some time, that's what they decided.

899. MR PURCHAS QC: So, it flooded the basement.

900. DR OHTA: Yes.

901. MR PURCHAS QC: And just tell me about the tanking of your basement.

902. DR OHTA: The basement is not tanked. It has flood warnings and machinery and that sort of equipment, and also anti-damp but no tanking.

903. MR PURCHAS QC: Have you examined whether that's possible?

904. DR OHTA: I think it would be possible but it would cost quite a lot of money.

905. MR PURCHAS QC: I think your concerns now are the same as the others, and really well-known to the Committee, so thank you very much, unless there are any other questions.

906. DR OHTA: Thank you.

907. MR PURCHAS QC: Then I call, if I may, please, Mr Larry Benjamin of the Royal College of Ophthalmologists, at slide 118. Mr Benjamin, you're a Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons and also the Royal College of Ophthalmologists. Is that right?

908. MR BENJAMIN: That's right.

909. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you very much. And you're a practising consultant eye surgeon.

910. MR BENJAMIN: Yes, I am.

911. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you. You describe the Royal College there but I want to go quickly to slide 121. You talk there among other things about the training of eye surgeons. Can you tell the Committee just a little bit about that?

912. MR BENJAMIN: Yes. All ophthalmologists who enter training, which is seven years long, have to do a three-day mandatory microsurgical-skills course, which is held at the college. And then we have other courses which go on through that training, all of which are held in the Skills Centre in our building in Stephenson Way. So, it's quite a centre for education and training of the doctors that we train in the country.

913. MR PURCHAS QC: And how important is that in terms of the career of an eye surgeon?

914. MR BENJAMIN: Well, we consider it vital. Most of the trainees have never used a microscope before, so, to get a good grounding in the basic skills is vital, and that's why we've made it mandatory, so it's very important.

915. MR PURCHAS QC: And how many trainees do you have through the building in a year?

916. MR BENJAMIN: 24 on a course, and 10 or 11 courses a year, so 250-ish.

917. MR PURCHAS QC: Yes. Thank you. And if we then just go on to page 123, we see here the equipment is set out, and you say there's no equivalent facility in the United Kingdom. Is that right?

918. MR BENJAMIN: Nothing as big or with such an equipment of amount that can hold so many people at once, no.

919. MR PURCHAS QC: So, is there any question, realistically, or relocation?

920. MR BENJAMIN: Not realistically, no.

921. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you. The sensitivity of the work that's being carried out, how important is it in terms of overall optical health?

922. MR BENJAMIN: Well, we work at very high magnifications, so any small

vibration will show up. We had experience of this in my own hospital, where a new unit was built and the operating-room floor vibrated when people walked past, so we had to vacate the building and it had to be concreted. You just can't work in that environment. It's not possible to do it.

923. MR PURCHAS QC: It's very clear. We can see somebody looking through the microscope, and the screen on the wall is an eye, is it?

924. MR BENJAMIN: That's the cornea in front of you.

925. MR PURCHAS QC: Cornea, yes. These are the sorts of treatments used for cataracts and macular degeneration and whatever.

926. MR BENJAMIN: Yes, all sorts of eye operation.

927. MR PURCHAS QC: In addition to that, there is also the lecture theatre in the basement – is that right?

928. MR BENJAMIN: That's right.

929. MR PURCHAS QC: On page 126, you set out your concerns. I think they're probably similar to others but, in the same way, you really need to have the individual assessment of your building at the outset.

930. MR BENJAMIN: Yes, we do, yes.

931. MR PURCHAS QC: It's too late once it's started.

932. MR BENJAMIN: It is too late once it's started.

933. MR PURCHAS QC: Right. Thank you. And so far as noise is concerned, concentration is very important.

934. MR BENJAMIN: Yes, and vibration is more important, but noise whilst lectures are going in is very disruptive.

935. MR PURCHAS QC: Yes. Thank you. And you in particular have a disabled employee.

936. MR BENJAMIN: We do.

937. MR PURCHAS QC: Anything else you wanted to add?

938. MR BENJAMIN: No.

939. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you very much indeed. I call Mr Nyota, slide 129, and this is the... Mr Nyota, your job is Chief Executive. Is that right?

940. MR NYOTA: Yes.

941. MR PURCHAS QC: Of the Methodist International Centre. The Wesley is operated by that centre. Is that right?

942. MR NYOTA: It is, yes.

943. MR PURCHAS QC: And everything goes to charity.

944. MR NYOTA: Yes.

945. MR PURCHAS QC: Thank you. If you go to 131, it's a view from the third floor, and you've marked there the demolition or works areas that are involved immediately alongside your property. Is that right?

946. MR NYOTA: Yes, there is demolition going all around the pub and Wilson House on all areas. When you're in the bedroom, you'll be watching all this.

947. MR PURCHAS QC: We'll go to 134, please, to get an idea of what's inside the building. I know the Committee have been to the outside. You'll have hotel bedrooms on the top. Is that right?

948. MR NYOTA: Yes.

949. MR PURCHAS QC: But you've also got conference and meeting rooms on the ground floor and basement. Is that right?

950. MR NYOTA: Yes.

951. MR PURCHAS QC: And does the use of the meeting rooms include examinations for UCL?

952. MR NYOTA: Yes, we have examinations from UCL, and I think some of the organisations here that are petitioners also do use it for examinations.

953. MR PURCHAS QC: If we go on to 135, it shows the auditorium, but 137, we draw attention in terms of the guests, that they include those who would be travelling, sleeping during the day, as well as studying. Is that right?

954. MR NYOTA: Yes, we have day-use guests that use our bedroom, and I think, on this call, what we are seeing, it would be almost a hotel made from hell.

955. MR PURCHAS QC: Absolutely. And if we go to page 140, you set out your concerns. The Committee will be familiar with those and will know what we're asking the Committee to do, but one particular one is the Cobourg Street construction site. Is that right?

956. MR NYOTA: Yes, it is. It's going to be almost adjacent to where after all those other buildings are demolished.

957. MR PURCHAS QC: And again, six months' notice, as far as you're concerned, rather than three months. Is that important?

958. MR NYOTA: It is. It is very important.

959. MR PURCHAS QC: Well, I think the other matters have all been proposed to the Committee, including flooding. Are there any other matters you wanted to raise in the time?

960. MR NYOTA: No.

961. MR PURCHAS QC: I'm very grateful indeed. Thank you very much. Sir, I'm obliged.

962. MR CRAUSBY: Mr Mould.

963. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Thank you. The promoter has indicated to these petitioners that, through the Stephenson Way Community Group, of which a number of them are members, that he proposes to establish, as soon as he reasonably can, the Stephenson Way Business Mitigation Group. That body, as the name implies, will be a

group whose function principally will be to look at means of mitigating the impacts of the construction of HS2 on businesses in Stephenson Way. The intention is that the agenda for that group should be established through discussion and agreement between the promoter and those who would be members of it, and that the group should speedily proceed to establish its modus operandi, to meet to discuss those matters that are of particular concern to petitioners with a view to establishing focused and targeted mitigation measures which will enable the issues that have been ventilated before you this evening to be addressed in an effective and timely way. That is the first point.

964. The next point is that Professor McNaughton briefly discussed some of the points raised particularly by Mr Farley earlier in the corridor earlier on this afternoon, and indicated that he would be very pleased indeed to meet again with Mr Farley and others who had been advising the group with a view to discussing some of the technical issues that have been raised before you and, indeed, I value Mr Purchas's language at least to consider, as part of the basic design process, the techniques that have been placed in the slides before you, and also to consider specific arrangements to seek to minimise, as far as reasonably possible, the impact of works that clearly have the potential to be disruptive, such as demolitions in neighbouring properties and so forth.

965. He will also happily discuss, looking further ahead, arrangements for the Cobourg Street construction site, although there is some little more time to discuss that and to think about ways of reducing the extent of that site, because it's not a construction site that comes into existence under the project until 2026, so there's time there to do a little bit more work in relation to that.

966. Turning to the question of noise, Mr Purchas kindly referred to paragraph 7 in the first appendix to the current version of Information Paper E23, which is familiar to the Committee, and that refers to 'Buildings which may be particularly sensitive to noise, including commercial, educational and community, will be subject to individual consideration by the nominated undertaker on the application of anybody or person responsible for holding a legal interest or estate in any such building.' I shall take those who have come before you this evening as being those people who have applied through the Committee for consideration on that basis, and we will go forward with those applications, as is anticipated by that paragraph. And amongst other things, we will consider whether it would be appropriate to introduce a trigger arrangement of the kind

that was mentioned, and discuss what would be the optimal means of giving appropriate protection from noise and vibration to those buildings, once we have a very clear and detailed understanding not only of the fabric of those buildings but also of the things that go on within them because, obviously, the right thing to do is to try and focus, as far as we can, on the details of what actually happens in those buildings. That is something that, I think, is anticipated can be dealt with under the aegis of the Stephenson Way Business Mitigation Group.

967. Questions of access of parking: our ambition and intention is that there should be no reduction in the current level of parking available in this area for people who hold blue badges. In terms of the routing of lorries, the lorries routed along Stephenson Way and, indeed, those streets to the south of Euston Road which have been mentioned, those are principally HS2 construction vehicles associated with the utility works that are going on in those streets, and which I fear, however disagreeable they may be, are essential to enable us to build this railway, so they really can't be avoided. But clearly, that doesn't mean that we can't do all that we reasonably can to seek to ameliorate and to minimise the effects, and again that will be something which will be the subject of the discussions with the Business Mitigation Group.

968. The question of notice and the adequacy of it: I hear this evening the particular concerns and understandable concerns from petitioners about the level of notice that they're likely to receive, given some of the activities that go on – examinations, that kind of thing. Again, a deeper understanding of their particular needs is something that the promoter anticipates being able to achieve through the working of the Business Mitigation Group and with that information, to try to give as much notice as is reasonably possible. Again, the best way of addressing that is through targeting the particular concerns. One examining body's examinations may take place at a particular time of year; it may be possible to pinpoint now the week during which those examinations are likely to take place in 2017 and then to begin working on making some arrangement to try and avoid that week for any percussive or intrusive activities. The sooner that that process can go forward, the better, and that is what the Group initiative is designed, amongst other things, to achieve.

969. Flooding: likewise, it is not in the interests of the promoter to flood basements of properties which hold valuable and sensitive equipment or, indeed, that –

970. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: I think the concern is not that it is done intentionally.

971. MR MOULD QC (DfT): No. Well, I know, but the way in which one avoids it happening, either by intention or by accident, is by investigating the buildings in question and then to, through the process of detailed design, including, for example, ground investigation, which I freely admit is something that has to be dealt with in detail – you know that. We haven't yet completed that exercise – to take steps both to model and to understand the performance of groundwater as the construction works proceed, and to take steps to, as far as possible, to avoid the kind of interventions that have been spoken to. But it is worth making the point that it is not in our interests to allow such things to happen, if we can possibly avoid it, because, if HS2 can be shown to have been the cause of flooding in a building and to have destroyed both the building fabric and/or equipment or materials within it, HS2 will have to pay compensation in relation to that. So, prevention is the better course in that respect.

972. I think I've covered the main points raised during the course of the presentation. Perhaps I ought just to touch on the question of the cul-de-sacs, because that seemed to be a point that was emphasised. I think it's always easy to suggest that something like that is a very straightforward matter to resolve. In fact, a good deal of thought has already gone into whether it would be possible to maintain a two-way flow – an access point and an egress point – which avoids the need for reversing along those two streets. At the moment, it is by no means straightforward to see how that can be done, because the physical dimensions and the area that is required for the works here don't leave a great deal of space. But again, I don't want to be heard to say that that is something that wouldn't benefit from further consideration. Of course it would; it's just that it's perhaps a little more challenging than sometimes is suggested.

973. Overall, the position is that there is room for a good deal of further engagement. The Business Group that I have mentioned is the vehicle for that and, as Mr Purchas said at the start of his opening, there remain procedures before the Bill achieves Royal Assent which will enable that process to be scrutinised, and we're as much alive to that as, indeed, no doubt, the petitioners are. So, I would suggest that the way forward tonight is for that Group to be established and for the particular matters – and, indeed, others that have been the subject of discussions in very recent times – the particular



matters raised through the evidence you've heard to form the subject matter and the agenda for early meetings of that Group. That is our response.

974. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Before Mr Purchas responds briefly, can I say that I think that, by getting the Group together and by the evidence of the expert witnesses and the ones who are involved in the organisations, we're grateful to you for actually helping to save time, and nothing that was said was dull.

975. MR MOULD QC (DfT): There is just one thing I ought to mention, if you'll forgive me: I know that there has been a discussion about whether the Group that I have just referred to should embrace all petitioners who have been before you tonight. That is to say, should it embrace not only those who have premises in Stephenson Way but also those who have premises on the other side of Euston Road? Again, I don't think that's something that one needs to resolve tonight, but I know that those who instruct me see some advantage at least in a group which focuses on Stephenson Way but then engagement separately with those organisations that are to the other side of Euston Road, because the impacts are different there. The works are of a different order. It's separated, to a degree, from the main construction works at the station, and it may be better to have a more focused group dealing with Stephenson Way and then another separate engagement process involving those petitioners to the south.

976. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: It may be horses and courses, but I suspect that having an information network will allow people to opt in for things that matter to them and opt out of things that don't.

977. MR MOULD QC (DfT): That may be right and, as I say, I'm not suggesting for a minute that these matters have to be resolved at 25 past 10 this evening.

978. MR PURCHAS QC: Can I deal with that last point first? We would be very unhappy indeed with the idea of having to form this group, of shared costs of expert evidence, on which we wished to rely on in ongoing discussion, should now be split in some way for the convenience of the promoter. We see, for example, Euston Road, as Mr Farley has explained, as a major centre of considerable activity and environmental problems, and so we hope the promoters here will respect the group that we've put together, and deal with it on that basis.

979. The Committee has our case on consultation, on traffic, on building protection and on notice. I would like just to go back, if I may, to the other three matters we raised, and the essence of this is not general discussion; it is, actually, of getting specific assessment at an early stage, so as to enable these premises to acknowledge to be sensitive and vulnerable, assess both for noise, ground-borne noise and vibration, for flooding, and in respect of the other matters we've drawn your attention to. That should be done now. The steps then to be taken should be identified as part of the target action plan. If I may say so, it reflects quite starkly the inadequacies of the generalised use of Section 61 and the real benefit of specific assurance to this Committee. We do urge the Committee to give support for the approach that we've taken in our evidence. I'm very much obliged.

980. MR CRAUSBY: Thank you.

981. CHAIR: Order, order.