

MINUTES OF ORAL EVIDENCE

taken before

HIGH SPEED RAIL COMMITTEE

On the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON – WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

Monday 25 January 2016 (Evening)

In Committee Room 5

PRESENT:

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

IN ATTENDANCE

Mr James Strachan QC, Counsel, Department for Transport
Mr Edward Briggs
Mr Alan Masters

WITNESSES

Mr Bob Birch
Mr Andrew Pibworth
Mr Simon Clarke
Mr Michael Gallagher
Mr Humphrey Tizard
Mr Brian Cable
Mr Robin Allen
Mr Tim Smart, International Director for High Speed Rail, CH2M Hill

IN PUBLIC SESSION

INDEX

Subject	Page
<u>The Association of the Residents of the Drive (Harefield Place) et al</u>	
Submissions by Mr Masters	3
Evidence of Mr Birch	8
Mr Smart, examined by Mr Strachan	13
Mr Smart, cross-examined by Mr Masters	19
Further evidence from Mr Birch	27
Further submissions by Mr Masters	28
Evidence of Mr Pibworth	29
Evidence of Mr Clarke	34
Evidence of Mr Gallagher	35
Further submissions by Mr Masters	37
Response from Mr Strachan	38
Closing submissions by Mr Masters	41
 <u>Ickenham Residents' Association</u>	
Submissions by Mr Tizard	42
Response from Mr Strachan	51
Closing submissions by Mr Tizard	54
 <u>Mr Brian Cable</u>	
Submissions by Mr Cable	55
Response from Mr Strachan	59
 <u>The London Wildlife Trust</u>	
Submissions by Mr Frith	64
Response from Mr Strachan	68
 <u>Denham Water Ski Club</u>	
Submissions by Mr Briggs and Mr Allen	71
Response from Mr Strachan	77

The Association of the Residents of the Drive (Harefield Place) et al

1. CHAIR: Order, order. We may as well start. I hope we're not keeping any of you from your Burns Night suppers. Mr Masters?

2. MR MASTERS: Good evening, Mr Chairman. I'll introduce myself very briefly and say that I will try and be succinct and cut things down. I do appreciate both the time of day and a lot of things already heard. Can I start off by just saying who I represent and why we're here, very briefly? You haven't heard from us before. I represent a group of Associations in part of Ickenham that you may not know, which is called Harefield Place. Harefield Place is almost a garden suburb. It's made up of the land that used to be owned by Harefield Place Stately Home. It was sold off in the '30s and '40s. This is various groups' private roads. There's the golf club which is effectively a central part of the community of Harefield Place. The golf club, you've heard a lot about the golf club.

3. I'm sorry. I'll pause and let the members – are you sure? You've heard a lot about the golf club and its impact to the public and we're very proud of the fact that the golf club, originally in its 18-hole form was one of the best golf clubs in the south-east. And just to answer, if I may, a question Mr Bottomley asked of one of your other persons some time ago? It was until a few years ago when the gas pipeline went through it. It was expected that the London Borough of Hillingdon would restore it. That was the aspiration and the promises. That didn't happen effectively because of HS2, because of the concern that things were going to happen around the golf course, the Council's argument was that it would have been premature to restore it until such time as they discovered what happened with HS2.

4. Why we've become more centrally involved is of course because it took, until recently, we were just a suburb of Ickenham caught by the general problems relating to Swakeleys Roundabout and the traffic. But of course, the haul road effectively goes through, particularly to the rear. It will destroy the golf course completely and will have a substantial effect in every way upon the residents. So, the residents of Harefield Place Estate will achieve somewhat of a double whammy – they're not only going to get the traffic implications that exist in Harvill Drive and Swakeleys Drive and the roundabout,

but they also have the problems now going to be associated with the haul road directly on top of them.

5. I'm going to call five witnesses. I'm going to call Bob Birch, who's an engineer.

6. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Can I suggest, just briefly, just to help us all? If we look at P1498(6) for a moment, which is the same image, but it's a different way of presenting it.

7. MR MASTERS: I was going to take you to 1972(1).

8. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: We can get there in a moment. If we can just look – the red lines are the people affected in this group of petitions.

9. MR MASTERS: Yes.

10. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Below that is, I think, Swakeleys Roundabout.

11. MR MASTERS: That's right.

12. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: On the A40. And to the left of your red lines, is the proposed haul route.

13. MR MASTERS: That's right. And to the left of the red line is also the golf course.

14. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Yes. So, there's the golf course in between, roughly in between, the haul road and your collection of roads.

15. MR MASTERS: Yes. Effectively, the golf course is to the left of the roads. And Harefield Place House is roughly where the road divides to the left – and it's a stately home. It goes back 100s of years. It's a beautiful feature. We did try and get members of the Committee to come and visit, and it's something I'm going to re-visit later on. I know how busy you were and couldn't have done that.

16. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Yes.

17. MR MASTERS: The problem is –

18. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: If we can go back to your images? And you can chart us through.

19. MR MASTERS: I will. Thank you. What I was about to say was that the trouble is that unless you actually appreciate our state, you actually haven't seen it, you won't understand the differences that exist in our roads to other roads. I think we're very fortunate to have the roads we live in. But, the ambience and the types of road is unique, very much, to Ickenham and those areas around. So, the damage that will be caused is substantial in many ways. Having said that, I was going through who I was going to call. I'm going to call Bob Birch in a moment who's an engineer. He'll just talk about our alternative proposals which we want to talk about. I'll then call Andrew Pibworth who's one of the ex-chairs of Harefield Place Golf Club. And I can say that they, apart from the public that attend the golf club, there has been over the years a thriving membership as well. It's in addition to the public – which is large – and he'll be talking on behalf of those members and the impact on them. Mick Gallagher will talk on the impact of the golf course from the point of view of his company that operates the golf course. And lastly, Simon Clark, the chairman of North Drive will talk about the impact generally. But our main message over to you and it's an important one, is that we're not here to moan – we're here because we think that we have a solution that's been overlooked; that is actually a very feasible and tangible one.

20. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: I assume you're going to tell us what the alternative is?

21. MR MASTERS: Now.

22. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Right.

23. MR MASTERS: Mr Birch?

24. MR BIRCH: Can I have A1972(1) please? I didn't intend going through all of the slides –

25. MR MASTERS: Can I –

26. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: We've got that. Thank you.

27. MR MASTERS: You've got this one here? Briefly, we'll go into the slides a bit more. But, the alternative – this is the lower portion of an existing railway track. It's a railway track with a high embankment, already in existence, with a bridge going off the river –
28. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Forgive me for saying so – unless you show it to the whole – and a bigger one – we won't get a clue until later on. It would probably be better if we had a clue straight on.
29. MR MASTERS: Okay. I think this is the one that's being pulled up now. 1972(1). I'll tell you what, I'll come back and I'll go to Bob, who will explain the alternative, then I'll come back to –
30. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: If he sits closer to you, he can also point to –
31. MR MASTERS: Yes.
32. MR BIRCH: Absolutely, yes.
33. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Would it help just to see slide 40 because they're two alternatives that the petitioners have put in their slides?
34. MR MASTERS: I think we can see them both.
35. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Let's just follow Mr Strachan for a moment, Mr Masters if we can, please?
36. MR MASTERS: Yes, I think 40 would be helpful. I don't disagree.
37. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: You mean you do agree?
38. MR MASTERS: I agree. It takes a long time to load, doesn't it?
39. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: No, it's very fast.
40. MR MASTERS: I don't disagree with that either.
41. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Is it working?
42. CHAIR: The issue with the slides is all the documentation of the last eighteen

months, two years is on there. And the weight is starting to slow it down.

43. MR MASTERS: Indeed. It must be a burden on all you, I'm afraid.

44. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: – hasn't made it all that much easier.

45. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Well, it does appear there's some – it's taking a while. It's slide 40 in your packs.

46. MR CLIFTON-BROWN: We have it in our packs.

47. MR MASTERS: Oh, there it is. I'm going to ask my colleague –

48. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Before you ask anything –

49. MR MASTERS: Yes.

50. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Mr Strachan, just help us for a moment?

51. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): The blue line is broadly speaking our haul road proposal. The purple line marked 2 is the first of the petitioners' alternatives which would carry along Skip Road and then turn down what is being referred to as a railway embankment and the join into the A40 in some manner.

52. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: In some way. And we aren't going to trouble ourselves with the canal?

53. MR MASTERS: No.

54. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Fine.

55. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Okay.

56. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Okay.

57. MR MASTERS: I'm going to ask Mr Birch just to talk through this because he's our engineer, effectively.

58. MR BIRCH: Are we happy that we know Uxbridge Golf Course, that we don't need those slides?

59. CHAIR: Yes.

60. MR BIRCH: Happy with that? Good. We're going to move on then to 24 please? This is the beginning of Skip Lane, which is opposite Copthall Covert, which is where you're going to dump the soil that's there. And it also forms part of Home Farm Road with Harvil Road going between it. The blue line indicates that we can go across Copthall Covert, up to Skip Lane and then down the embankment onto the A40. Could I do slide 26, please? Slide 26 is going to demonstrate that there's an existing facility. It's around about a third of the distance of the proposed haul road. So, if you're saying it's going to be 25 million pounds you're going to spend on your haul road, or HS2's haul road, this existing facility is there, so I'm suggesting that there's a saving of possibly 6 to 7 million pounds because all you will need is a traffic management system going through this particular area. I'm going to move straight onto 31. As I say, this haul road goes right the way through; with the facilities of HGVs; with the concrete works in it; with other materials that you would need to –

61. MR CLIFTON-BROWN: Can you produce a plan of what this involves?

62. MR MASTERS: Well, the plans we have I'm afraid are – being under resourced – are what they are, which is why we really wanted to get you to come down. The viaduct exists. It was a main railway right up to the '60s. It's more or less all intact.

63. MR CLIFTON-BROWN: There must be a plan you can point at least to it on.

64. MR MASTERS: Well, if I take you back to the plan I was going to introduce before?

65. MR CLIFTON-BROWN: Right.

66. MR MASTERS: It gives you an indication of the first part of it. That's the stretch of the railway viaduct up to the A40. And just imagine that cutting, going all the way up Skip Lane, and the bridge which, according to HS2 didn't exist, because they're suggesting we'd have to – so, anyway – is there and it's in place. So, it's one of those situations with a little bit of local knowledge, there's an alternative route that's been missed, and that's the message we're trying to get over to you. We're not against it. We just think there's a much better route.

67. MR BIRCH: Can I take you back then? Can I do 1972(5)? 1972(5). This shows the proposed HS2 route. In the top right hand corner, up here, that's the end of Skip Lane. That's where our beginning slide, I've just shown you, goes all the way round.
68. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Can it be moved 90 degrees or not?
69. MR MASTERS: It would be useful if it could. Can you turn it 90 degrees? Well done.
70. MR CLIFTON-BROWN: It's the wrong way round.
71. MR MASTERS: Wrong way round. Would you just like to demonstrate where it is?
72. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: We can see your alternative.
73. MR BIRCH: Can you see it? I'm just there.
74. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: We can see what they're proposing.
75. MR BIRCH: Okay. So, that's the end of Skip Lane which, as I explained, is already a facility which is already concreted. It's already there. So, that leads you on to – and if you could take me to slide 31?
76. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Does the golf course go to the other side of Harefield Place?
77. MR BIRCH: Yes.
78. MR MASTERS: Yes. In fact, the golf course still. You don't touch it. Sorry Mr Bottomley, I interrupted you.
79. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Don't worry. I'm married. Does the haul road go through the golf course? Or is there more of the golf course on the other side of the haul road?
80. MR MASTERS: Yes. It's going to destroy –
81. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: I didn't ask that? Is there more of the golf course on

the other side of HS2's haul road?

82. MR BIRCH: Yes.

83. MR MASTERS: Yes.

84. MR BIRCH: So, it doesn't affect the golf course whatsoever. And this is the slide where we had, as I said, this is the end of Skip Lane. The embankment was built in 1907. It was in use through 1964, in July. The embankment is still there. The sleepers still there. It was built for locomotives, and so a haul road such as a HGV lorry weighing 20 tonnes, it can easily take on board. If I can move on to slide –

85. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: 20 tonnes?

86. MR BIRCH: 34. 20 tonnes lorries.

87. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: How heavy are the lorries?

88. MR BIRCH: Sorry, locomotives are much heavier than HGVs.

89. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Okay. Right.

90. MR MASTERS: We're only talking of service of type 1 material, so I think there's already type 1 material on the haul road. And it's been there a long time, but a replacement wouldn't be 25 million pounds worth.

91. MR BIRCH: I've gone all the way down the embankment, taking photos which you can clearly see in your pack, but this leads you to an existing slip road that comes off of the A40. It's used by vans and lorries –

92. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Sorry? Your proposal is to use this as the haul route?

93. MR BIRCH: Yes.

94. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Okay. I don't think you need to go through it in great detail.

95. MR BIRCH: Absolutely.

96. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: I think what could happen is the promoters can respond. And if they put an expert witness in, you can question them, and we'll learn much more that way.

97. MR MASTERS: Could I just say one thing before that? This proposal has the significant advantage of linking directly to the main trunk road which has capacity to take it. And therefore every disadvantage you've heard of, – using the farmers' fields, the traffic through Ickenham the golf course – would go. So, this is actually a win win.

98. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Yes. it's not for me to respond to that. Would it make sense if the promoters gave their view on this proposal? Would you agree?

99. MR MASTERS: Yes. Yes, please. We're more than happy.

100. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I'm going to ask Mr Smart to just take you through it. Can I just put up P1498(7), because I think this will give you an overview of the area? It's an aerial photograph. And if I just take the cursor from down here. This is the line of the alternative that's being suggested, right up here and then round – you can't see the last bit, but it's round, just across to Harvil Road. And our haul road is shown within the line of the grey which is the land taken for the Bill.

101. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: And how does yours come onto the A40? Does it go on to the slip road or does it come on to the?

102. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): It joins the slip road into Swakeleys Road Roundabout and just to be clear as to where we've got to. You heard about our assurance with Hillingdon about looking more at the junction. One of the things that we've done as part of our work is some VSim modelling of the junction and we looked at partial signalisation of this roundabout to assist in taking our traffic through Swakeleys Roundabout. Both TfL and Hillingdon wants to do some more work on that but that's where we've got to.

103. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Swakeleys Roundabout was last improved five years ago?

104. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): It was, I understand it may have been changed from a three lane roundabout down to two lanes.

105. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Ah.

106. MR MASTERS: I don't think so because it cut – one of the issues that TfL have looked at was whether it could be made a three lane, and it can't, so I don't think it was a three lane. I think they've widened it slightly and done things, but it's always been a two lane.

107. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: The last change was about five years ago? And the change in 80s and 90s was when the underpass was put through.

108. MR MASTERS: Yes. There were some smaller changes five years ago. Of course, the roundabout existed when the underpass came, was upgraded.

109. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Well, I understood it was originally a three lane roundabout taken down to two lanes. But, anyway, for the purposes of our proposal, we access Swakeleys Roundabout and that then enables us to take traffic principally out towards the west, around the roundabout, through partial signalisation. Mr Smart, I'm going to ask you to deal with the implications of the alternative. Can I just point out, I may need to show you on another map book, but this land here, all the way down, is a SSSI? It's the Fray's Farm SSSI. And there's another SSSI here, called the Denham Lock Wood

110. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: On the old railway line?

111. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): On the old railway line. As the old railway line bisects the SSSI, the Fray's Farm SSSI, and then there's another SSSI at the top, in this sort of triangle area.

112. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: So, there are two problems. The problems are the SSSI's status and how you join the A40?

113. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes. And there's an additional flooding issue that's of concern also. Mr Smart will explain that. It would involve further works for lifting the area out of the flood zone.

114. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Well, they could presumably have done it with the A40, slide the road across so it joins the roundabout, going parallel to the A40 for a bit

before it came in where the other one was going?

115. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Shall I –

116. MR SMART: It's difficult to achieve.

117. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): So, what I was going to suggest is Mr Smart is going to take you through the proposals. What the petitioners shown, down at this part. This is the A40 obviously. There's the Swakeleys Roundabout junction and there's the Denham Roundabout junction further to the west.

118. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: And you obviously can't join a dual carriageway at speed between two roundabouts and so close to the next one?

119. MR SMART: Correct.

120. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: That's not going to work.

121. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): So, I'm just foreshadowing it. And as for taking traffic westwards, the idea was to go underneath the embankment, then build a slip road up on to the A40. That has its own construction issues, in addition to the fact that the traffic splitting as it comes west, you can see from one of the signposts, there's a slip lane already on the A40, as it's going west. You'd be putting another slip lane in to a slip lane. Mr Smart, perhaps you can – I don't mind which order you take.

122. MR SMART: Yes.

123. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): If you just deal with the principal points that we've discussed.

124. MR SMART: Yes. Well, the first thing I should say is the Committee are probably aware that the key construction traffic occurs in what we call phase 2 of the phasing in this area which is when we're actually forming the railway trace. And that's the main load of bringing material in which occurs for about a year. So, it's quite key that we get this haul road in as quickly as possible in order to maintain the programme.

125. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: This is hauling in?

126. MR SMART: This is hauling in to form the trace along with, as you go down the

embankment beyond. So, there is a programme constraint on getting the haul road in. First off, as the ground falls away there are issues with water there. I'm not suggesting there aren't issues with water on our route.

127. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: On the way going north?

128. MR SMART: Yes. And there is greater potential of flooding as you come down towards the canal. And in fact on the on the petitioner's route that's a flood zone 3, which is a high probability of flooding. But we would need to deal with water anyway. As Mr Strachan has said, as you come through here, this is actually through the 222 SSSs, which we will be coming through. And our route, in avoiding SSSIs, except for about 150m, and we are in discussions about the potential of how we might mitigate that –

129. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): – just this corner where you collect the SSSI, in between –

130. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: So, that's the explanation for the kink?

131. MR SMART: Yes, and it appears that the ancient woodland may not be ancient woodland and it may be the Wildlife Trust would prefer us to move it more that way rather than the SSSI. But, that's just a matter of some fine tweaking. Then, I think, as Sir Peter and Mr Strachan have already indicated, we then have to get a junction configured on to this section of the A40, and perhaps it might be helpful to go to the petitioner's slide on this, which is A1972(37). So, you can see how the existing A40 sits up and we'd have to get a junction on to this section which already lies between two quite close roundabouts –

132. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: This is between Swakeleys Roundabout and Denham Roundabout?

133. MR SMART: That's right.

134. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: And you're on the south side heading west.

135. MR SMART: And getting a slip road into that is not just difficult from a highway engineering point of view, you've also got all the extra time and disruption to create it,

as well as actually on the Swakeleys Roundabout, there is a junction which comes on to the roundabout and can be, if required by the highways authority, signalled, so that the lorries just come out onto the roundabout. And you haven't got this issue of coming, of traffic merging between the two roundabouts. And I think I probably said, you've also got all the construction traffic generated to actually get this haul road, whereas the route that we have chosen follows the contour. So, we're trying to minimise the amount of engineering work we have to do to create the link road which allows us to a) get it in as expeditiously as possible; and cut down the amount of construction traffic required to create it, to the lowest possible.

136. MR CLIFTON-BROWN: How many vehicles an hour are we talking about?

137. MR SMART: Well, in that busy year we are talking about 470 or 960 two-way vehicles but that is, Mr Clifton-Brown, as you've heard before, our worst credible option. We are looking at how we can, and we're still working with the programming of the engineering works just to see how we can actually limit the amount of traffic we would need to take on, on to the, well, that link road, and ultimately, the road network. And also of course, we are looking, when we get further information about how we can minimise the amount of fill we would need by either re-using material that we're taking out of some of the cutting areas, if we can. They're not all suitable for engineering fill. And also minimising cutting slopes. So there's still other work we can do to minimise the amount of traffic that this area will experience. But based on our worst credible, we're looking at about 960 two-way for that year. And then it goes down for the – I'll have to check – but I think I'm right in saying, it goes down to about 120 two-way HGVs for the three and a half to four years when the tunnelling is happening, and then moving into fit out.

138. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): The 960 two-way movements are for bringing in material for the trace, not for the construction of the haul road?

139. MR SMART: Yes, that's right.

140. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Just to be clear. Yes.

141. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: On your proposal, at Swakeleys Roundabout, is that a two-way junction, coming in? Is the haul road two-way?

142. MR SMART: Actually. I think it's the petitioner's slide that might actually show where – I'm trying to find the best exhibit to show you that. Effectively, it is two-way. Where is that? I can't find it.

143. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Our proposal's on P1498(9). So there's that –

144. MR SMART: Yes, you can see how that would come on so you'd actually go off and signal on and we wouldn't necessarily have to do a full signalisation of it. If it is required, there's work being done on Swakeleys Roundabout, but I think the early work would suggest we'd only have to do a partial signalisation on this leg, and I think another leg, which would actually significantly improve the flow there, irrespective of HS2 traffic.

145. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Can I just show you slide 36 of the petitioners' slides, A1972(36). I think the petitioners say, well, there is an existing slip road off the A40 eastbound to serve the railway embankment area, which they show here, Mr Smart?

146. MR SMART: Yes.

147. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I think that doesn't deal with the traffic coming out onto the A40 using the haul road which you'd have to provide for?

148. MR SMART: Yes, that would be quite a difficult configuration, joining the A40. And I don't think, between those two junctions – well, from looking at it from a highways perspective we severely doubt we could get a junction that would operate in a safe manner there.

149. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Can you get off the A40 reasonably safely? Or is it getting on to it? Or is it both?

150. MR SMART: Both. Getting off is probably, in this instance, probably less of a problem, if you're coming from one direction, but we need to allow for both. And, as I say, the key time is that nine months' maximum, I think it's nine months, that we've got this.

151. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Ask the petitioner – we're slightly reversing the normal procedures – but I think it's better that you have a chance of challenging what

they say rather than them having to challenge what you say because I think –

152. MR MASTERS: I'm grateful. Could I ask some questions?

153. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: In a moment, when Mr Strachan's finished.

154. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I was just going to, just so the Committee's got the full picture, P14993(2) just helps you on the location of the SSSI it will impact. It doesn't show the full SSSI. I just wanted to show you what we were doing is trying to avoid the SSSI. We go into it for that 150m section and we're planning to avoid the ancient woodland in that area. I think we're in the process of discussing an assurance with the Wildlife Trust to consider taking the haul road into the ancient woodland because, contrary to what we understood previously, both Natural England and the Wildlife Trust consider the ancient woodland may be of less importance, still important, but less important than the SSSI so we could potentially move about –

155. CHAIR: – if you could get HGVs onto the A40, they'd be going the wrong way? So they'd have to up Swakeleys Roundabout and around the back anyway, unless you could engineer underneath the road.

156. MR SMART: If we did that, yes. We'd have to go under the road, then build up an embankment and then we've still got the problem of the slip road joining right at the base of another slip road. So, that's why there's a challenge on the highway engineering of it.

157. MR CLIFTON-BROWN: What will be the legacy of this haul road, could it be used for anything usefully afterwards?

158. CHAIR: Golf.

159. MR SMART: I'm not sure –

160. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Our proposals are to remove it.

161. MR SMART: That's right.

162. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Because of the aspirations to restore it into a golf course. We, as part of our arrangements, with the construction of the haul road, we

reconfigure the golf course for an 9-hole golf course that can be played after we've reconfigured, but whilst the haul road is operating. And after we finish using the haul road, the intention is to take it out.

163. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: The gas work, gas line, reduced you from 18-holes to?

164. MR MASTERS: It reduced the working holes to 12. It used to come right up to the road. And obviously, we don't even think that the 9-hole golf course that's being suggested is –

165. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: I understand that but just trying to get –

166. MR MASTERS: Too much information, I'm sorry.

167. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: No, don't.

168. CHAIR: – to try and improve the roundabout on to the A40, which already gets clogged up.

169. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Can I just, on that note, just show you the further modelling work we've done. It's at P15003(1). It's not last word because I know TfL and Hillingdon have got comments on it, I just wanted to be able to show you what work you have done since being in Committee on this last occasion. This refers to the assurance and the bottom refers to detailed traffic assessments of Swakeleys Roundabout. And the VSim model, last paragraph, you'll see is the forecast impacts and we've tested various scenarios which are explained in these bullet points: existing case; partial signalisation – and our conclusions at the moment are shown at P15003(7). But with, you can see the reference case, i.e., the existing situation shows you network delays, both in the a.m. and p.m. of 1.31 and 1.32 minutes. With HS2, without doing anything, we increase the problems. With partial signalisation, and then with our haul roads, you can see we reduce, in terms of network delay, we reduce the network delay below that to which it currently would occur within the existing case. That's through partial signalisation. I say, I emphasise, because I know TfL and Hillingdon are anxious for us to look at that in more detail. That's not the last word on it but our initial work is showing a way in which we can mitigate the impact of using the haul road, connecting

into Swakeleys Roundabout, to take our traffic west, with that signalisation arrangement.

170. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Just as a matter of interest, if there weren't HS2, would the possibility of signalisation be normally be done by the Department of Transport or would it be done by the highway authority?

171. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I believe it's TfL. It's a TfL junction.

172. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: – highway authority.

173. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes.

174. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes.

175. CHAIR: Okay

176. MR MASTERS: Mr Smart, if I could ask you a couple of questions? First of all, have you visited the haul road? Have you walked it?

177. MR SMART: I have visited the site. I haven't walked the haul road.

178. MR MASTERS: Okay. Are you aware that the haul road is actually, for the majority of its route, an existing footpath? So, in fact, it doesn't affect the SSSI because people are allowed to walk across it.

179. MR SMART: I do understand that. There's a couple of issues with it though. First is, we've got heavier lorries than I think it was built for. But, also, although it is a footpath and I think is in separate ownership than or it's different, perhaps I should say, stewardship, there's still an issue – I'm not the expert on this at all – but there's an issue with the ecology because it's still ecological use of that footpath and animals use that, even though it bisects two SSSIs.

180. MR MASTERS: Well, there's a difficulty and I'd like this explained, how can it be difficulties of ecology when in fact it takes people, dogs, us, people walking the whole route all the time, because in fact it's used a lot by the residents of our road? And, as you imagine, dogs, people –

181. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: You aren't putting to the witness –

182. MR MASTERS: I am.

183. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: – that people can't walk through SSSIs, are you?

184. MR MASTERS: No, what I'm putting to the witness, effectively a well-used footpath, but effectively, it is, if you like, an isolated area that goes inside of a SSSI. I don't think in anyone's dream they'd have considered it part of the SSSI. It may be on a grid said that, but in fact the road goes straight through and certainly the markings for SSSI are shown on either side. But I'll move on. Mr Smart, can I just ask you again this question? Have you carried out any engineering feasibility studies in relation to this route as opposed to the route you've chosen?

185. MR SMART: We have looked at the best way of forming a route through there. So, you've put forward this route. We were aware of a number of issues there but we chose the route we did because we want to avoid the SSSI, as we've already said, and need to stay on the high ground, and follow the contour. And minimise disruption to the golf course. And get the construction of the haul road in as quickly as possible to allow for the programme constraint. And minimise the construction activity that is required to build the haul road itself, which only adds to the traffic problem if you've got more construction to do. So, looking at all those things and looking at the way it travels in that area, we came up with the option that we did.

186. MR MASTERS: So, was the primary constraint timetabling and scheduling?

187. MR SMART: No, it's a balance. Just achieving the best engineering solution to alleviate the –

188. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: It's common ground, the timing matters. It is common ground that Route B, I think we can call it, is more up and down.

189. MR MASTERS: It isn't.

190. MR BIRCH: It's flat because –

191. MR MASTERS: It's totally flat. It's not on different contours that's why I asked you on the haul road.

192. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Rather than being super lawyer and interrogative,

you could actually say: 'I'm going to put to you that Route B is as level as, let's call it Route A'.

193. MR SMART: Well, it might be in certain areas but it's not when you have to join – The key thing is configuring a junction at the A40. That is the real problematic issue, apart from other things I've mentioned –

194. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: So, the flooding is still a real?

195. MR MASTERS: There's no flooding.

196. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: No flooding.

197. MR BIRCH: Well, joining Swakeleys Roundabout is equally as difficult if not more difficult to join Swakeleys Roundabout.

198. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: If you put that to Mr Smart: it's as difficult their way as your way.

199. MR SMART: No, we don't think so. We think that because there is an existing entrance there that National Grid use. And we're coming on to a roundabout so we can signal that, whereas, whichever way you do, coming on at a midpoint, you've got to have a slip road, and if you can't signal on to that without stopping the A40. So, I just don't see how we would sensibly be able to configure a junction there that worked without a major disruption forming it, which is the first problem, and then actually having something that worked with the junctions.

200. MR MASTERS: Well, let's just take that point about the junction which is an important one, a stage further. Now, a lot of times with Motorway services and matters of that sort, you have built routes, don't you, where the Motorway traffic will go in to a lane –

201. MR SMART: You can.

202. MR MASTERS: – where the lane's cut down. So, this isn't a common difficulty is it? It's just a matter of highway engineering.

203. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: It's something we wouldn't allow that close to a

junction because you've got fast traffic –

204. MR SMART: Exactly.

205. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: – you've got slowing traffic; you've got accelerating traffic; you've got major problems.

206. MR MASTERS: It depends where you put it on the –

207. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: How close is your entrance to the Swakeleys Roundabout?

208. MR MASTERS: Well, actually you can come off the slip road wherever you like and go along to a convenient position anywhere along there to come back over. So, in fact, you could put it halfway between the two. There would be no issue.

209. MR SMART: Well, there would be because you have sight lines and you have to have a slip road and you've got the construction to build it. So, the disruption to the main road would be significant.

210. MR MASTERS: Well, you've already got, the difficulty with that coming east, you've already got a lay by and the route coming off, so you've already physically got a route off the A40 now, down to the trunk road. The difficulty is coming back on, I accept. But, to be quite honest, if that is the only difficulty, over the mess you're creating by bringing it back in to Swakeleys Roundabout, it's not –

211. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: I think rather than the pejorative language, let's try and stick to the engineering, if you don't mind.

212. MR MASTERS: Yes.

213. MR BIRCH: If we can talk about the engineering? Skip Lane is already there. So, your programme, surely, has been shortened because you have an existing facility there that's concrete –

214. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: That's Skip Lane up the top?

215. MR BIRCH: That's it. That's common –

216. MR SMART: It's a private road which is used by a number of different users, but we would then have to come on to Harvil Road and come back down Harvil Road to get on to our site.

217. MR BIRCH: No, you wouldn't. Copthall Covert is a field. Within that field, you can put an entrance anywhere you wish. It doesn't have to be the five bar gate that is the existing there. It can be right opposite Skip Lane if you wish. So, all the traffic would be under traffic lights, would just come straight across and into Skip Lane. It doesn't have to come along Harvil Lane at all. So, I don't – on that particular argument –

218. MR SMART: I think what we're doing is just having a discussion around how we can form a link road and each one has an impact on somebody else. We've heard this many times in Committee. We would then be having an impact on the businesses up there, who would say we don't want the haul road, etc. We have looked at all these things and we've come up with the best option that gives us the fastest way of constructing a haul road to relieve the traffic and one we believe can be delivered safely in terms of traffic engineering and not maximise construction traffic to just build the link road. And so –

219. MR MASTERS: Mr Smart, can I just put a hypothetical to you? Supposing you did choose that route and we did the route we're suggesting, can I just see if we can agree on the advantages? You wouldn't destroy the golf course, would you? You wouldn't go anywhere near it?

220. MR SMART: We would be going through two SSSIs.

221. MR MASTERS: Just deal with the advantages. You've made your point on the SSSIs. Just go with me for a moment.

222. MR SMART: The advantage is the golf course, of course.

223. MR MASTERS: Thank you. You wouldn't need to take out the farmer's land we heard of before? You wouldn't touch that because the haul road goes straight through there, would you?

224. MR SMART: We wouldn't take out the farmer's land.

225. MR MASTERS: You would be connecting directly to a trunk road, so you'd be relieving, you wouldn't be taking any traffic problems relating to Swakeleys Roundabout?

226. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): That's –

227. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: I don't think you can jump into that one because as far as we know you're creating massive problems rather than solving problems.

228. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes. Just to be clear, that's a temporary stockpile area which is part of that land that's taken, for stockpiling in order to take material out. So, we'd have to find somewhere else.

229. MR MASTERS: No, but the haul road goes – it may be a temporary stockpile area, as well. I understand that. But there's another reason the haul road goes through there too. Can I just go back, with the exception of Mr Peter Bottomley, obviously it is a much greater advantage in highway terms, if you could achieve to connect directly to a trunk road that has enough capacity, than putting vehicles back on the local network. That must be right.

230. MR SMART: No, because I think you, and as in fact is on the slide in front of you, by some modelling work, which we're still continuing to do, we believe we can improve Swakeleys Roundabout, irrespective of the traffic we're putting on it, and the amount of construction we'd have to do to form a junction, and I go back to my point, that this is essentially for the nine months of our heavy wagons, the costs of that and, more importantly, for the local people, the disruption, and the construction traffic necessary to create that junction would be significant. And in my view, it would actually be more disruptive than remodelling the junction because if we go to your slide, I think, which is 1972(18), you can see how we could signal on to the slip road coming up to the roundabout which is a much better solution in terms of forming that junction. Because this is actually where the National Grid came in.

231. MR MASTERS: That sounds very good, but it misses the problem that Swakeleys Roundabout is already at overcapacity and by putting your 470 vehicles an hour back on there, you're creating a problem that's going to, if I may say so, backfire on you tremendously, because what you're doing is that nothing is going to be getting

up the road to your works. And in fact it's going to mean delays whereas a route going directly there off the A40 should be considered to be a massive advantage to you.

232. MR SMART: Well, we can only configure it one way. And I've already said we don't, can't, we don't think we can configure it safely. And, the overriding point is, we believe – from the work we've done with TfL as well – that this, signalling this junction, would actually alleviate the problems on Swakeleys Roundabout. And to come back to my point, the time that we're going to have vehicles there, plus the other work we're doing to mitigate the amount of construction wagons that we would have on the 'heavy lift,' if I can use that term, for forming the trace. Whereas, major disruptions to form a new junction, right in the middle of the A40 western avenue, is, to my mind, completely nonsensical.

233. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: It's a two-and-a-half-year job for a start.

234. MR SMART: Yes.

235. CHAIR: We know the A40 problem. We know there's going to be problems with Swakeleys Roundabout, which is why more work needs to be done. The real problem is: if you go from that roundabout to the M25 or the M40, or coming in, that's the one section which is quite fast on the A40. And you're then trying to get heavy goods vehicles, going quite slowly, on to that road. And I therefore think there is a safety challenge. I'm not saying that there aren't problems with Swakeleys Roundabout but there will be a challenge if you start putting heavy goods vehicles into what will be quite rapid traffic coming off the Motorway network.

236. MR MASTERS: That sounds logical but the reality is Swakeleys is so absolutely at capacity, as soon as there's a holdup, vehicles are turning back to Denham Roundabout in any event.

237. CHAIR: Yes.

238. MR MASTERS: And so none of these solutions are ideal but the solution that's being proposed effectively for the route diverts 50% of the lorries in from the east, directly to the site, via this constructed haul road that does go on contours, you'd never imagine. There may be a quid pro quo, so you have the vehicles coming in and coming

back on the main roads.

239. CHAIR: Perhaps we need two haul roads; one for them going in and one for them coming out.

240. MR MASTERS: Well, no. You could put the traffic back on the main road because that's exactly what's going to happen here as soon as you put it back on the roundabout.

241. CHAIR: Okay. Do you want to ask your last few questions?

242. MR MASTERS: I've finished, sir, on this. I'm quite happy. I've made my points.

243. CHAIR: Okay. Any more questions Mr Strachan?

244. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): No. I should add that in relation, it's not a question for Mr Smart, just some response. We have assessed the other impacts of creating a haul road from the residential area. We do set the haul road back from the residential area. It is separated from the residential area. There are some visual impacts which we've identified in the Environmental Statement. And that generally speaking, the noise impacts are confined I think to Harefield Place where the Carvery operates. But we managed to keep the construction noise impacts and the use of the haul road noise impacts below those levels of concern for the residential properties and therefore we don't see the haul road, although it does create some visual impacts, as creating overriding other problems for the residents in the area.

245. CHAIR: Okay. Brief final comments, Mr Masters?

246. MR MASTERS: On this, may I just say that it's easy to say it's a two-and-a-half-year job and it's doing this but you're looking as though this was a major junction. And one presumes this is just going to be traffic for the route.

247. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Anything on a Motorway-equivalent, and the neighbour of a Motorway-equivalent A road is a major job.

248. MR MASTERS: Well, the limited amount of traffic coming off and going on, for any capacity it would take, is something that's been achieved elsewhere. And there's a

balance to be had between those matters and the impact on Swakeleys Roundabout and residents.

249. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: We should have had you working for him when I did three and a half years of this.

250. MR MASTERS: I'm not convincing you. I can see that. But, I'm going to try and power on on another issue of I may? May I ask Bob just to finish what he was saying on this, if you don't mind. And then I'll move on to other matters.

251. CHAIR: Okay.

252. MR BIRCH: Basically, it was slide number 35. Thanks. 1972(35). This just shows the embankment. And it ends up at the A40. You can go directly underneath the A40 and you can turn right, which would lead you to the junction that would go out of – this is midway point, we're back to the junction going on to the A40. I'm trying to demonstrate here that it doesn't flood. This was taken a couple of days ago. There were vans that come off of the M40/ A40. They came off that existing slip road that I showed you, which went east. You can now go underneath the Motorway and you can come up west, which then takes you up the embankment road there.

253. MR CLIFTON-BROWN: Could I just ask you? It's all very well getting under the A40 but how do you get back on it again? That's a major construction project.

254. MR BIRCH: Do you think that's a major construction project?

255. MR CLIFTON-BROWN: I don't know, I'm asking you.

256. MR BIRCH: Yes. No. I'm just thinking of Hillingdon Circus. And coming off at Swakeleys Roundabout, that junction's probably 300 metres. This is three times the distance. You could introduce for your time period of nine months that you have your 450 lorries coming down, a 50-mile an hour speed limit there. You've done it from Greenford. You've done it all the way up to Hays. There's no reason why you can't extend the 50-mile, if we're that worried about that safety issue there. But I think that same safety issue, when you come off Hillingdon Circus on to the A40 going west, is exactly the same here. I don't believe there is a two-and-a-half-year programme to put in one slip road because why would you do it up to Swakeleys Roundabout? It's not

going to take you two and a half years to do that. Could I move onto slide 39 please? Where I'm coming from here, and its impacts on all of my neighbours basically, there's a satellite compound you've asked to be built, or you're telling us you're going to build, for HS2, up round on Swakeleys Roundabout. Each of these arches can easily be adapted to house whatever you wish – cars, if you're going to park them, materials if you wish them to be secure. This is existing. I walked it. It's solid concrete, if you like, underneath those arches, and again, the embankment road which is flat and has been since 1907 goes straight to these arches and goes straight through via Skip Lane to Copthall Covert.

257. So there are economies of scale here. You have to take out an awful lot of greenery to put your satellite site in. I'm going to go to slide number 54, please. We're trying to do a double impact here. What we're trying to do, away from – asking you to have a look at our proposed haul road is to try and introduce some locally used soil from the excavated material. This is to create a bund that runs the entire length of the A40. This is acting as a dual photograph for me because, on the left-hand side of the picture, you can those trees. Every single tree goes. Absolutely all of that greenery goes because that is where you're going to build your satellite site. That is where the haul road goes up, and they will have to engage gear one, gear two to get up that particular hill.

258. As I say, there's a dual purpose for that. That is the area you're going to go up with HS2 haul road, but you could use it as a bund, which thousands of tonnes of materials could be used, and I'm going to go to number 56 to finish off, please. I took Nick through this particular demonstration and he very kindly said the use of route 2 could be looked at, and I'm just asking you again, could I walk the route with HS2 people or even TfL people, just to demonstrate that it does work? It is not a flood area in any way, shape or form. I walked it just like week. Thank you.

259. MR MASTERS: On that point, members of the Committee, I wondered – we did try and ask whether you could come and visit. I know you've got a deadline until March, but I have a plea that you won't realise the possibilities of this route and why it stands out a mile and why there's a big mistake being here, that it's not properly considered unless you saw it yourself, and that wouldn't take you long, but you would see what's existing. You would see that what's been said – I mean, if you look at what

was originally said by HS2 about our routes, they would have to build various bridges. Well, the bridges are already there and intact. The whole route is there and intact. It goes right to the A40. Look, even if there were problems with connecting to the A40, it wouldn't be too difficult to draw up a scheme to connect to Denham.

260. CHAIR: Right. Okay. You've made your point.

261. MR MASTERS: I made my point. What I'd like to do is call very briefly my other witnesses who are dealing with impact. It depends on how much you want to hear about.

262. CHAIR: How many witnesses have you got?

263. MR MASTERS: I've got three but I'll deal very quickly with them.

264. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: That interfere with your stops, that affects them, affects the catering, affects local residents – take it granted that we actually appreciate quite a lot of this. Be brief. Be kind.

265. MR MASTERS: We will do that. Could I just make one point before I call them? I'll be very brief with all of them. It's our second point. It was just hinted to by the witness. We just want to make it clear, we're asking – we say there's a positive use for all of this soil. It doesn't have to be shifted away. There are four plots of the golf course that need to be reinstated. There's an awful lot of soil would be assisted in going there, as well as the acoustic bund that the residents are seeking, where the transport...

266. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: I appreciate that. Either you or one of your witnesses can say whether you agree with Hillingdon, who seem to think that the golf course could not be usable as a golf course after what HS2 are proposing.

267. MR MASTERS: Certainly I will deal with that. Can I move on with my witness? Can I call my next witness who is the ex-chairman of the Harefield Place Golf Club itself. I should say that he represents the members rather than the general public. He also represents – you are a committee member now.

268. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: We run deep as the system here.

269. MR PIBWORTH: Good evening, Chairman, members of the Committee. In the

interests of saving some time, I don't propose to go through in detail the submission I have already sent in. It's before you as evidence anyway. What I would like to do is run those slides on the screen and just make comments on it rather than repeating it. If I could have A1990 first, please. As you see, my name is Andrew Pibworth. I have been a member of Harefield Place Golf Club for 18 years, ever since I retired.

270. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: You don't need to read out each line. We can read faster than you can speak. We've read that one.

271. MR PIBWORTH: Okay, fine. I'm happy with that. Could I have A1989? What I've tried to do with this one is put a chronology of what's happened to the golf course and the golf club, and I should say at this stage that sometimes I will refer to Uxbridge, which is the golf course, sometimes Harefield Place, which is a separate entity as a member's club operating on it, and...

272. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: We've got that picture, because it's consistent. You get the gas coming in halfway down, you have discussions with Hillingdon and others about who restores it and its waiting for for HS2.

273. MR PIBWORTH: Yes.

274. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Right. Okay.

275. MR PIBWORTH: I would like to point out a few interesting things from here. You see that in 1990 our club membership was around 560.

276. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: It's now coming slowly back up again.

277. MR PIBWORTH: No, sir, it's going quite the reverse. In September 2004, the press first carried out an announcement of the gas pipeline coming through, and in February 2006, London Borough of Hillingdon formally consented to the new pipeline. In July 2006, our membership had already dropped to 184. An unfortunate lease was issued to an Irish company...

278. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: We've read that, and the membership has now gone up to – four years ago to 223. What is it now?

279. MR PIBWORTH: 65.

280. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: I see. Okay. So it's come up and gone down again. All right.

281. MR PIBWORTH: It's never come up, sir.

282. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Well, forgive me saying so. 223 is higher than 184, but...

283. MR PIBWORTH: I think I'd have to agree. Sorry. I have made one or two unfortunate typos.

284. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Well, we can see that in 'membershow'.

285. MR PIBWORTH: The outcome of the whole thing, really, was, from September 2004, the entire golf course was under threat. The tenant who came in had received a...

286. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Mr Pibworth.

287. MR PIBWORTH: Yes?

288. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: We understand that. Carry on with your next point. Don't go on with that, please.

289. MR PIBWORTH: You don't want me to talk about chronology anymore?

290. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: No, thank you.

291. MR PIBWORTH: Very well, sir.

292. MR MASTERS: Can you talk about the point of whether or not there will be anything in having a nine-hole golf course.

293. MR PIBWORTH: It has been mentioned and it was in my evidence itself that the National Golfing Magazine did describe the course as 'a little gem'. The golf course operates in all respects like a private golf course, as far as we're concerned, as a club. So we can provide handicaps and so on which are internationally recognised and we are particularly proud of what we do with young people. We have a trainee scheme running which is at no cost to those youngsters and it involves three of the local schools: Vyners, Breakspear...

294. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Thank you. I think if you go onto your page 12, you may want to give us the first line after 'would it ever open again'.

295. MR PIBWORTH: I may agree.

296. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Well, it's your words, so if you don't...

297. MR PIBWORTH: If I skip right through to there I would have to point out, unfortunately in one section earlier, I made a typo and it says '2019' and of course it should say '2010'. I apologise for that.

298. MR MASTERS: I just want to take you to the point about whether you agree...

299. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: It's on the screen in front of you, if that helps.

300. MR PIBWORTH: Okay. I would have to say that, throughout, London Borough of Hillingdon has been most uncooperative, of course, with all the applications, and I do want to want to make the point that we're going in the time – there was no way that they could force the tenant to do anything, because of...

301. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: That is the past. You're giving us evidence that Hillingdon are right in saying there would be not much in keeping the golf course going if the haul road comes through.

302. MR PIBWORTH: Exactly.

303. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Okay. That I think is your value as a witness.

304. MR PIBWORTH: But all along the line survey have resisted doing anything in the way of restoration...

305. MR MASTERS: Just stay with the point, Andrew.

306. MR PIBWORTH: Using the HS2 as an excuse...

307. MR MASTERS: The Committee wants to know about your view on keeping the golf course open as a nine-hole golf course.

308. MR PIBWORTH: Okay. Well, first of all, I think you asked about, would it ever

open again? Almost certainly based on the numbers you've seen of 65 members now and more leaving this year I'm sure, it would almost as a club cease to exist. There are three other public courses...

309. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Don't read that out. Essentially, you and Hillingdon agree. Hillingdon said that to us earlier today. You are agreeing with Hillingdon. You and Hillingdon are in agreement.

310. MR PIBWORTH: No, sir.

311. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: You're not in agreement?

312. MR PIBWORTH: Not this club, no. We want an 18-hole golf course. We want it put back as it was, operating as it was, because in our view, as I've said in my evidence, there are three public golf courses in that area. Two of them are threatened with closure. Haste Hill is the one that was...

313. MR MASTERS: Chairman, if I could just say that it is our case that there will be a real difficulty with this being reopened after two years as a nine hole golf course, the cost of that and things. We're talking about the golf course being penned in by a 25 metre high fence. I hope you can imagine what 25 metres are. How many storeys that is. Seven or eight storeys. So the ambience would be lost and the people who want to come in relation to that. I'll go on with my next witness. Thank you, Andrew. Can I call—

314. MR PIBWORTH: Well, I would like to just add one other thing.

315. MR MASTERS: Yes.

316. MR PIBWORTH: In our view as a golf club, the nine hole course is totally impractical. We couldn't raise handicaps on it. It's likely, in my view, having seen it to be maybe three rows of three holes short, virtually pitch and putt. It will inevitably destroy trees. It will inevitably destroy existing greens and fairways, as will the haul road running right round the course and all the way along the west side. Thank you.

317. MR MASTERS: Can I call, if I may, Simon Clarke. Again, I'll be very brief with him, Chairman. He is the chairman of the Residents Association of North Drive, one of

the various associations to come together. I want you to get the flavour of the uniqueness of our road, which you haven't seen, and so I would hope you'd let him take you through some of the slides very briefly.

318. MR CLARKE: Mr Chairman. There are really three main issues I would like to talk about on behalf of the residents. One is traffic congestion, one is pollution and the third one is amenity. If I could have slide 1972(2)1. Our roads already – and I'm sure you've heard this from many people before – are gridlocked. They're gridlocked from 6:45 a.m. to around 9:30 a.m. and from 4:00 p.m. until around 8:00 pm. This is from traffic trying to get across the A40 from not just Ickenham and Ruislip but from Harrow and beyond. There are many large businesses in Uxbridge. The public transport unfortunately is solely restricted in practical terms to the metropolitan line westbound. So it's very restrictive. There are also a significant number of people that work at the airport.

319. This slide shows that junction at A40 Swakeleys is absolutely rammed with traffic, and I would imagine that probably the difficult travel time to get across from the feeder roads that are all congested is already today is excess of 25 minutes per day. If we could now move on please to slide 1993(5). So very briefly, the mansion at Harefield Place is a listed building. It was converted into prestigious offices in 1978 and unfortunately for the last two years has been vacant. If you now go onto slide 1993(7), please. An application was submitted, and I believe has recently been approved, to redevelop the listed building to convert it into luxury apartments and to replace the modern extension with 16 luxury apartments.

320. Unfortunately, the property overlooks the proposed current HS2 haul road on an embankment with a three metre high barrier. It's highly likely that this redevelopment of this valued asset may not go ahead, because I doubt that anybody would wish to purchase an apartment overlooking the haul road.

321. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Or to be delayed.

322. MR CLARKE: Or be delayed, and if you just flick onto 1993(8), that can give you some impression of what the finished development will look like. If I could just add that, within the grounds of the manor is a substantial lake, large grounds. It just gives you the verdant nature of our particular area and the roads coming off are very

much similar. If I may now move onto 1993(10), I will talk briefly about the issues. You have heard before from other petitioners about nitrogen dioxide and the effect of pollutants from diesel vehicles.

323. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Can we take that as read? We've gone through this on a number of occasions.

324. MR CLARKE: Sure. I will show you later on a slide that shows the concentrations of pollutants around the A40.

325. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: We've also seen those with an earlier petitioner today.

326. MR CLARKE: Okay. I guess my final point then, really, is around lack of amenity. If I can ask you to go to slide 1993(20). You've heard mention earlier today of public footpaths. Currently, residents of Ickenham and surrounding areas enjoy access to the Colne Valley Wildlife Park, to the Grand Union Canal, to the London LOOP and beyond. With the current proposal for the HS2 haul road, my understanding is that the public footpaths will be blocked, whereas our alternative proposal would allow that access to be maintained.

327. MR MASTERS: Thank you.

328. CHAIR: Thank you very much. Thank you for being brief.

329. MR MASTERS: One more. Moving swiftly, Chairman. I'm going to call Mick Gallagher, who is the proprietor of the golf course.

330. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Is this the 19th hole or is that something else?

331. MR GALLAGHER: It is, yes. This is Hole 19, which I'm the proprietor of. I am a leaseholder of the London Borough of Hillingdon. I pride myself on my business. 14 years now, and as you can see here, I'm also vice president of the golf club. I run the junior section and I've been a member of the club for some 38 years since I was quite small. I've been on the Committee for 20. My company employs minimum 30, seasonally up to 50 people.

332. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: 1998(2), if we may, please.

333. MR GALLAGHER: Their jobs would seriously, seriously be at jeopardy if this haul road was to go through the golf course. We provide a wide range of facilities for all golfers, for local residents; toilet changing areas, hot and cold food. We're actually open to all members of the public. We have many groups that come to us, including all the three schools. We work alongside the London Borough of Hillingdon. We have many groups, as you can see, Metropolitan Police, fishing clubs, Breakspear Probus groups, etcetera, etcetera. We work with the local schools. We also fund a Christmas party for underprivileged children at Meadow School, which is paid for by ourselves. There is some perks of the clubhouse.

334. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Yeah, we've got that in front of us now.

335. MR GALLAGHER: Obviously that's the carvery area. That's the view out. What you're proposing at the end of that view, out the carvery...

336. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Shall we go onto five?

337. MR GALLAGHER: You will see probably, at the horizon, 25 metres of netting. This is from the other end of the clubhouse. Once again, you will then see netting right the way up. As you can see, this is quite a fantastic view, and it's sort of to do with the ambience of the business, this is why people come here. It's a lovely place to come. What you're proposing to do, the haul road, I consider as environmental vandalism of a view, when there is an alternative route that could be taken seriously. As I say, we do a variety of stuff with the local community, very much in the local football club and various other local organisations. I'm trying to sort of keep it brief.

338. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: You're doing well.

339. MR GALLAGHER: Obviously there is a loss of many jobs. A lot of these people have worked at the business for over 20 years now. We employ a lot of people from Brunel. They value their job. They are actually struggling to get to me on time at the moment because of the Swakeleys Roundabout problem, which, with more traffic on there, is a problem as well for them to sort of go to work. In my view, as a business, it's going to be catastrophic. Something I've really worked hard at, I think we are a value to the community and we pride ourselves on that, and I think the community feel that they are part of us as well, as I say, which we really do work well together. In my

opinion, the haul road must not be allowed to go ahead.

340. I think we really do need to look at this alternative route very, very, very, very seriously, because I firmly believe that this is the solution. It keeps the amenity open. It keeps the community together. It keeps the youngsters playing golf. They will have nowhere locally, if Ruislip and Uxbridge close, they will have no golf courses locally available to learn their golf.

341. CHAIR: Thank you very much.

342. MR MASTERS: I've got some closing remarks to make, but I don't know whether my learned friend wants to...

343. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: If you make your closing remarks, he can then respond and then you can make final closing remarks.

344. MR MASTERS: Can I just recap? We come to this late. We've tried to be pragmatic. We haven't come here to criticise. We come here to try and offer a solution, one with local knowledge. It appears that, for some reason, this route has been overlooked. Perhaps it should have been looked at some time ago. Perhaps, because of the tunnel, the attention has been taken away from what may have been much more viable alternatives, but time shouldn't be a reason for you not to look seriously at this option. Now, even if it can't connect directly to the trunk road, which in my respectful submission needs to be looked at, there is no reason, when you have a track going all the length of this route, it's flat, it's dry, already elevated, the bridge is going off the road, then it's not too difficult to connect to Denham Roundabout which doesn't have the capacity constraints of Swakeleys.

345. The second point I wanted to make and I made before, we're coming to you with a positive alternative about spoil. Give it to us. Don't waste it by hauling it away with unnecessary traffic when it can be used to restore the golf course back to a proper 18-hole golf course afterwards, which would have been destroyed by transit and also has a great benefit of creating an acoustic bund on the north side where the compound will go. It will ease noise that's been a problem for the residents of our road for some time. So those are the points I wanted to make. If I could just say, the advantages, it would take traffic – it would take away the traffic problem you have on Swakeleys Roundabout.

346. It would retain the golf course. It would stop the gridlocked traffic roundabout. It would keep open all the footpaths. It would also keep open the fishing lakes that would go, and so the advantages, in my respectful submission, on balance, must be things that can't just be rejected. They have to be seriously looked at, and my plea to the Committee is please give this some serious consideration. I know it's late. I know we're late to the party, but this is a very viable solution. Again, I said I'd come back to this. I would ask the Committee before they finalise matters in March, to take the trouble of coming and visiting and having a look for themselves. I know that may be difficult. I won't blame if you can't do it with the time you had here, but that is a plea that I ask upon you. Those are my submissions.

347. CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Strachan?

348. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: If wouldn't mind, just tell us why the haul road came into existence in the first place.

349. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I was going to start with that. The purpose of the haul road, which came in by way of an additional provision, additional provision 4, was a response to the effects of the construction in this area for the residents, particularly on Harvil Road and Swakeleys Road where our hybrid bill proposals necessarily involve considerable amounts of HGV traffic going along those roads with the consequential effects on residential amenities in noise and air quality terms. As a result of that being aired in front of the Select Committee, the Select Committee made some recommendations to look at traffic proposals in this area.

350. As a consequence, the project looked at that again and the haul road proposal came forward as a way of significantly mitigating those effects of the construction in this area for the particular periods that Mr Smart has explained, when materials brought in to create the trace – and then there's an opportunity to use such a haul road potentially to take away material to reduce sustainable placement, which was another concern of residents. I appreciate that we have looked at the effects on the golf course, but the other side of the coin of the haul road and its main purpose is the beneficial effects it brings to Swakeleys Road and Harvil Road and the many residential properties that lie along that.

351. That was the thrust of the haul road proposal. I should have mentioned Mr

Seabourne, who came along to petition, suggested looking at some sort of haul road, which is precisely what we've done. That is why we've come forward with additional provision 4. We have considered alternatives, but the reasons explained by Mr Smart, the alternative that's now being put forward by the Petitioners simply does not work. The principle problems he has identified of getting the traffic onto the A40 and the junction arrangements that would be necessary is not only the engineering that would be necessary, but it simply doesn't work with the program, which is of course to bring in material to create the trace.

352. The scale of the operation he has described, and the difficulties, the highway engineering difficulties of putting in slip roads into the A40 simply don't work for the reasons he has given. There are other important objections that will arise, even if those problems could be overcome, one of which is the consequential effects on the SSSIs, which we are, as part of the project, generally seeking to avoid. Our haul road, although it does have an effect on the golf course, which I readily accept, does have the virtue of avoiding those SSSIs and of course other footpaths which would be disrupted if one were to go down that embankment even if it were possible.

353. So that sets a context for why we chose the haul road proposal we did. Mr Smart has already explained, and I referred you to the traffic appraisals as to the way in which we believe we can achieve the use of that haul road with Swakeleys Roundabout with consequential improvement measures to assure the traffic flows through that, and that's what we're continuing to do, and can I just emphasise that, as part of that, the assurance that you heard about from – that we gave to London Borough of Hillingdon, the contents of which are accepted, include a brief to look at traffic reduction, further traffic reduction, in this area to reduce traffic and to reduce the amount of material that goes out on the roads and the haul road, as part of our overall objectives. So it doesn't stop with the introduction of a haul road. There are other measures to the proposal.

354. There were one or two other points that cropped up in the closing remarks, such as the loss of fishing lakes. I'm not sure where that came from. We're not proposing to close fishing lakes as part of our proposal. We do have the effects on the golf course, and I just wanted to show you P14993(4), because, as part of our assessment of this proposal, we have taken professional advice from a golf course designer and we have identified the way in which a golf course of nine holes can be created, which can be

used whilst the haul road is in operation. This is the design that's been put forward by a professional golf course designer. Our haul road goes around the golf course and we have safety netting. That's really to prevent balls striking our HGVs on the haul road. That's the purpose of the safety netting. You sometimes see it as golf courses.

355. That's something that will go in at our cost, but there is a way in which a nine hole golf course can continue to be used during the haul road's operation and thereafter we strip out our haul road and we take it away, and the discussion that we have heard about earlier with Hillingdon were all about providing a global sum figure which we thought was appropriate, bearing in mind the cost of these proposals, although not tying them down to what they necessarily would like to do with the golf course arrangements. This is one proposal which I think we costed in the region of £600,000 – £700,000, the golf course arrangement itself, well within the global sum that we were proposing. That's the way we see the haul road, although it does have an effect, I readily accept, on the golf course, as balancing the construction benefits that are achieved for Harvil Road and Swakeleys Road, and enabling some continued use to take place.

356. Can I, just whilst we've got this plan up, just deal with Harefield Place? That's the proposal for redevelopment that came forward in September 2015. It's a planning application, as I understand it. This had permission granted last week, so one that's been successful. P14987 just gives you an idea of its location. You can just see it at the bottom of the screen, just here. Our haul road is over here, and there's already considerable planting in between our haul road and that proposal. So I certainly wouldn't accept for the moment that our proposal for a haul road is going to preclude that development coming forward, and in addition to the mitigation we put along our haul road, clearly it will have an effect, but I don't see that it would necessarily preclude it, but as has already been pointed out, it would certainly not be precluded once the haul road is then taken out, once the scheme has been constructed.

357. On the public footpath, that's something we have specifically identified. The footpath in question crosses the golf course. I think it's somewhere around there, and as part of our proposals, and this is in the AP4, we have proposed a staff crossing where the haul road crosses the footpath to maintain safe and convenient access for people to continue accessing the wider amenity areas to the west. So they will be able to cross our haul road safely during its operation, and that's identified in the environmental

statement, one of the measures we're trying to ensure will not prevent people accessing these lake areas and the walks to the west. I think that probably covers the main issues, and I refer back to Mr Smart's evidence as to the practical problems with the A40 without repeating them all for you now.

358. CHAIR: Brief final comments, Mr Masters?

359. MR MASTERS: Briefly, if I may. May I just comment, since it's there, on 14987? The golf course by its very nature isn't flat. It consists of something like seven or eight hills. The engineering operation for the haul road means it's up and down. The Harefield Place house which you've looked at, it goes down into a valley, and there's going to be several storeys, so the impact of the haul road is going to be easily seen. What the Committee said when they rejected the tunnel was that we were looking for HS2 to come up with significant mitigation. The problem with the mitigation that's been advanced is it doesn't achieve that, because it puts all the traffic back on to the local roads before the roundabout.

360. If I may say, that's nonsense. That isn't significant mitigation at all. That just means you have a bottleneck somewhere else, but it all tails back again. You might as well have it. It is a ludicrous solution, as I've no doubt others will demonstrate. We're saying, look, you have an existing infrastructure here that they've completely forgotten about. It's been there, totally flat, it runs all the way. It's a question of will and determination to come up with a better route. We are concerned that people have – it's trying to stop a juggernaut, or perhaps I could use the term engine, that's going along, and people are missing the obvious points. Now, there may be some more work that needs to be done into how we connect this to the A40, but it's a far better consideration to make than anywhere else.

361. What I ask the Committee to do is to seriously look at, in their recommendations, this alternative route being taken forward, possibly to be looked at in the other house, in the Lords, if that's possible, possibly as an AP6, rather than be dismissed out of hand, because if this route is viable, if it could work, then it's going to alleviate substantial problems for everybody. It is, as I said earlier on, a potential win-win which shouldn't be rejected. I'm grateful for the presentation.

362. CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Masters. Right. We're now onto AP4: 195, Ickenham

Residents Association represented by Humphrey Tizard.

Ickenham Residents' Association

363. MR TIZARD: Evening.

364. CHAIR: Hi.

365. MR TIZARD: Please don't be concerned that I'm going to go through all the slides. I'm not. You already heard an eloquent description of Ickenham already. I'm not going to develop that, except to say one thing: we have about 11,000 souls in the village and about 5000 households. That is surely to go up. Well, it is going up already by about 8%, because of the development of Ickenham Park, and if we go to slide A2006...

366. CHAIR: Is that the ex-RAF or military place which they're building or...

367. MR TIZARD: Exactly. It's a MoD base which is being converted into housing, various types of housing. I beg your pardon. Four? No. I'll just come back to it in a moment. Anyway. I beg your pardon, five. In between the two. Ickenham Park is now about half developed, and in order to provide improved access to the site, signalisation is at a road called Aylsham Drive, which is situated about there. About there, and what is happening and the way this is affecting the traffic volumes, and you saw this in June last year, matters have gotten worse, considerably worse, because that signalisation and the increase in the population of Ickenham – it's a traffic control signal, so the more traffic that comes along, the more often it turns to allow traffic to come off Aylsham Drive onto Ickenham High Road – means that traffic congestion is occurring on the northbound around there, up along the lane and across, up to Ruislip.

368. It's not only an evening rush hour problem. It is also now a morning rush hour problem. That is the extent to which population growth and the increase in traffic is now affecting the traffic problems in Ickenham. We'll come back to that later, because that it is important in terms of the traffic exiting Hill Road from West Ruislip construction site and its effect on pollution there. So going to our petition and to the proposals in response to that petition. First of all, looking at the traffic issues that we are concerned about. Their proposal for that is the haul road, which we have heard quite

a lot about recently, and I want to develop that point now further. What we are saying is the route is the route for the haul road is wrong. It should not exit onto the slip road onto Swakeleys Roundabout, and let me give you the reasons for that.

369. The problem is that the roundabout is congested, and not congested because the roundabout itself is configured wrong. It's congested because of exit blocking, so that you cannot alleviate those problems by changes to the roundabout alone. Now, what HS2 have claimed is that they have done this VISSIM report. Now, you may already know that VISSIM is a modelling system which stands, obviously, for 'visual simulation'. It's not a modelling technique like LINSIG or TRANSYT or ARCADY which look at statistical analysis of traffic. It takes each individual vehicle that is added to the road and plots its course across the network according to the capacity of the road and the junctions.

370. Now, one of the things that you do when you develop a model like this is you have to validate it. To be sure that you've done your model right, you have to check that when it runs with existing traffic volumes, it performs in a way that the network performs as observed currently, and this they haven't done. First of all, there is an analysis which you may or may not have seen, which TfL did on their VISSIM report, and in this report, the TfL state: 'No information is provided on well how the base year model validates the current observed traffic flow data'. That is the problem. They could do this, because this VISSIM model enables you to – it provides a 3D animated representation. You can actually see an animation of how the traffic flows through our specific conditions.

371. If it was validated properly then what you'd see on this is the traffic going up north for instance to the p.m. peak, up Swakeleys Road, on a stop-start basis. If that were the case, whatever they did, then the traffic that leads up to the roundabout is going to tail back because the demand to access that roundabout exceeds the capacity of the roads that lead away from it. There are a number of other aspects in which this model does not convince at all. I don't know if you have that analysis here in the – on their tables where they try and demonstrate that their model is actually mimicking the junction, they are not measuring the queue length that the model produces against the actual queue lengths that have been observed.

372. In fact, they have maximum queue lengths – whether these are observed or modelled, we do not know – they have maximum queue lengths which are less than the average queue lengths. They have queue lengths which curiously are exactly equivalent – queue lengths in metres which are exactly equivalent to the delay in seconds. So this analysis doesn't even bear a basic scrutiny, in fact. So we have no confidence in it and neither does TfL. TfL, as you've heard Nick Hurd say, say that this solution is neither safe nor is it feasible, and the reason that it is not safe is this: that if you can't get any more capacity through this junction – so again, let's say in the p.m. peak, you saw those pictures of congestion leading up to the roundabout, it means that any additional vehicles that you add to that queue will simply lengthen the queue which already reaches routinely back to the A40.

373. CHAIR: You're arguing that Swakeleys Roundabout can't take the traffic?

374. MR TIZARD: Yes.

375. CHAIR: Haven't you given undertaking to Hillingdon that you're going to have a look at this?

376. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): We've got two undertakings. One was the transport assessment work which we've done, has been referred to, and TfL is providing comments to us on it, which we are looking at now. I think they provided comments last week, and we've got the further assurance for a brief to reduce the impacts of construction through Hillingdon, including the impacts onto the A40, and one of those measures is measures to include traffic flow and highway safety at the affected roads and junction, including but not to be limited to the A40 Swakeleys Roundabout, as well as some of these other junctions, Ickenham High Road, Swakeleys Road, Long Lane junction.

377. CHAIR: All right. The point I'm making is that...

378. MR TIZARD: No, I understand.

379. CHAIR: We probably agree with you that there's a problem with Swakeleys Roundabout.

380. MR TIZARD: Exactly, and...

381. CHAIR: What we haven't seen is an alternative.

382. MR TIZARD: Okay. Well, what we are saying is that, as proposed, whatever they do to the roundabout, you are going to have severe safety problems, and they are twofold.

383. CHAIR: Well, we still understand that. I mean, we've been discussing this roundabout for months.

384. MR TIZARD: Yes, but I'd like you to understand what the safety problems are, because when you are looking at the alternative, which is proposed by the drive, you say that has safety issues.

385. CHAIR: Yes.

386. MR TIZARD: I'd like us to compare the safety issues for the one that's proposed by the drive to the sort of safety issues you are going to have on the Swakeleys Road roundabout exit.

387. CHAIR: Okay, but we...

388. MR TIZARD: Because there are equivalents on it. You talk about proximity of junctions and the problems of that. That is a safety issue that occurs with the Swakeleys Road roundabout in a way which I'll explain in a moment, because, if you are saying the capacity is already exceeded now, and if you add extra vehicles to that queue, it will simply – it already goes back to the A40. They will queue on the A40. That creates a safety problem itself, because the number of vehicles that they're proposing to add is 73. 73 HGVs takes you all the way back to the Denham Roundabout. So you've got safety problems there, but it gets worse, because when they see the queue that's there, what vehicles will do is say, 'Well, I'm not getting off here. This is far too dangerous. What I'm going to do is go onto the next one'.

389. Well, if you go under the underpass, you then come to the junction with Hillingdon Circus, which is the next junction along. Now, there are two problems there. First of all, the Hillingdon Circus junction is already at capacity. There are already severe problems with congestion at Hillingdon Circus going north, and the traffic, if we go to A2006, the next one along – it's a bit difficult to see. I'll put my finger on it, but

the actual slip road for the off-slip road going up to Hillingdon Circus is about there. So a long, long slip road. It already creeps back towards the A40. The thing is that the on-slip road from Swakeleys Roundabout leading down to it is just 50 metres short of the start of the exit slip road to Hillingdon Circus.

390. As you get more vehicles bypassing the Swakeleys Roundabout and exiting towards Hillingdon Circus, it will fill up that slip road completely. It means you've got tailbacks on that slip road going back to the A40, which is exactly where the on-slip road from Swakeleys Road arrives. That is a very, very significant safety hazard, and this is a very bad area of the A40 for accidents because of the proximity of those two junctions. So you've got severe safety problems by increasing the queuing on Swakeleys Roundabout both at Swakeleys Roundabout, the junction there, but also at the one following on, as people seek to divert the problem.

391. CHAIR: Okay.

392. MR TIZARD: When TfL have said is that the Swakeleys Road roundabout is not safe. So they haven't yet evaluated the drives proposal. So we are saying is, let's evaluate this. Let TfL do an independent comparative assessment of the safety of the drive proposal as against the Swakeleys Road roundabout.

393. CHAIR: So TfL are responsible for Swakeleys Roundabout?

394. MR TIZARD: Yes.

395. CHAIR: And they are saying one of their roundabouts isn't safe?

396. MR TIZARD: They're saying that the roundabout, the proposals that have been put forward...

397. CHAIR: Then why don't they do something about it?

398. MR TIZARD: Well, why don't they...

399. CHAIR: Well, they're responsible for the roundabout.

400. MR TIZARD: What we're saying now is the next step in this process should be that TfL should evaluate the drives proposal. They haven't done that yet. So to say it's

not safe, let TfL decide which is the safest, because there are severe problems with the Swakeleys Road roundabout one. They haven't looked at the solutions of how you get the – by the way, on the business of the way that the drives proposal actually meets the A40, there is already a junction just about 100 metres to the west of that which goes off to a temple. I can't quite remember which denomination of exotic religion it is, but there is already traffic coming off that road and onto it. It's not as if this is a new issue for that section of road, but we've already got traffic going on...

401. CHAIR: It's not really a new issue for us, because as long as we've discussed Hillingdon – there's a terrible problem with the roads, not actually particularly because of the growth of Hillingdon but because people from Hertfordshire and Buckinghamshire drive through it as well as the local residents, on roads that weren't built for that. We know there's a problem on the roundabouts.

402. MR TIZARD: Yes.

403. CHAIR: We know there is an ideal solution which is why Hillingdon and HS2 are looking into what can be done with TfL. Instead of repeating what we know...

404. MR TIZARD: No.

405. CHAIR: I'm necessarily sure you've come up with a better solution.

406. MR TIZARD: No. Hillingdon and TfL are looking at ways to reduce the traffic to such a number as you don't need a haul road at all. Now, what we're saying is that it's unrealistic to expect HS2 to reduce that traffic, construction traffic, to such a level that it no longer becomes any nuisance to the roads in Ickenham. What we're saying is that, because in these figures – by the way, the 550 that you heard earlier, that is a maximum which, in their agreement, can be increased, and there's limit to how much it can be increased. The other thing is, that's just HGVs. They haven't included any of the other traffic associated with construction whatsoever. So we have absolutely no reassurance that this study is going to produce any alleviation of the problems, the traffic problems, in Ickenham.

407. There is one solution which we agree will, combined with a couple of other things which I'll mention in a moment. That is a haul road which gives direct access onto the

A40. Now, HS2 don't think it's safe. Why don't we let the people who are responsible for our highways say whether it's safe or not? Let them make the analysis to whether this is safe, because it is safe or at least safer than the Swakeleys Roundabout solution which they safe is unsafe, and we have got a solution which is going to answer the problems of Ickenham traffic.

408. CHAIR: Okay.

409. MR TIZARD: So we are asking for that – the drives solution to be considered seriously, to be evaluated independently in terms of the engineering, and by the way, Bob Birch's presentation to the costs of the proposal, the drive haul road, the proposal to have the, sorry, the haul road down the old railway track, his estimates of the costs are a fraction of the cost of the golf course haul road. Let me tell you another problem. They talk about SSSIs.

410. MR HENDRICK: There are a lot of assertions being made here, and I'm conscious of the fact of the number of them and the fact that HS2 haven't had an opportunity to respond to them, and it's almost as if they're being taken as read here. Could we hear some response from HS2 as to the assertions being made with regard to the different schemes and safety before Mr Tizard goes on to another subject?

411. CHAIR: Well, I think we best leave HS2 at the end, but they've already responded, because essentially you're supporting the change in the haul road from the previous petitioner.

412. MR TIZARD: Absolutely.

413. CHAIR: Okay. Well, you've made that point. What is your second point?

414. MR TIZARD: Okay. The second point is in terms of the air quality. One of the things that we – at the moment, the proposals that stand still involve traffic coming out of the West Ruislip and Breakspear Road compounds joining the Ickenham public roads and then down to Swakeleys Road. What we proposed in our petition was that you should have the traffic going along haul roads across the sites, so it goes across from West Ruislip to Breakspear Road, then across from Breakspear Road to Harvil Road and then onto the haul road, so you wouldn't have to have any traffic going along Ickenham

High Road.

415. Now, what they have said in their response is this: that their construction program means that they're not going to build the haul roads across their sites the first off, but this seems to us to be complete nonsense. It's standard practice in a construction project if you've got the construction site, to work out how you're going to move personnel and materials across the site, along the full length of the site. That's one of their arguments against it. The second argument is that they would have to build bridges in order to make it feasible. Well, there are only two bridges that are required. One is across the River Pinn, which will take no time at all, get a squad of Royal Engineers to put a Bailey bridge across it.

416. That's no problem at all, and the other one they're saying they need is across the Breakspear Road. Well, you don't need a bridge across the Breakspear Road. All you have to do is to cross the road from one site to the other in order to provide a through route. Now, going across the Breakspear Road to Harvil Road, apparently, according to Mr Strachan, when he was responding to Mr Adams' petition on Wednesday, apparently the traffic is already being rerouted 100 from 200 from the Breakspear Road to the haul road, so they must already have a route across the Breakspear Road, Harvil Road site in order to get to it.

417. So there is absolutely no reason why, at the outset of this project, traffic can't be taken right off Ickenham's roads by having a haul road across the West Ruislip site to the Breakspear Road and over from Breakspear Road to the Harvil Road. Once that's done, once that's in place, effectively, you would have all movements into an out of these sites directly from the A40, if you have a haul road coming out of the A40, which means that all of the traffic from – all of the construction from traffic can be taken off Ickenham's roads, which is in line with the Construction Code of Practice. So that's our second point. We're asking for a haul road right at the outset to go right across the sites to connect to the haul road.

418. The third point we're making is on excavated material. We still think there is too much material being dumped on our fields. Now, again, Mr Strachan, in his response to Mr Adams' petition last week, said that AP4 was an improvement. Well, can we have A2009(15) again, please? 2009(15). Mr Strachan didn't actually say how, in

measurable terms, AP4 was an improvement. Indeed, if you look at the map to show what extra dumping is going to be done on Ickenham in AP4, it's difficult to see where he is coming from in this. What we're saying is, it's perfectly possible to remove all but a small amount of the spoil that is excavated by rail, and we want limits set on how – at the moment there are no limits.

419. There is absolutely nothing, no statutory device by which we can say HS2 is exceeding its limited. We want specific limits to be set of how much spoil can be dumped in our fields. It just seems to be getting more and more. The next point is on footways. We continue to be dismayed by the options for the footpaths. Mr Mould said previously that they will be able to come up with a solution for the Breakspear Road footpaths, and if we go to P14737, this is one of his solutions for the Breakspear Road footpaths. Remember what he said was that they would be able to have segregated footpaths which maintain traffic flow under the bridge.

420. Well, here, and this is first solution, they have a – once the footpaths have been taken into consideration, you can just see it, it leaves a carriageway of 4.5 metres wide. Well, that doesn't allow for two-flow traffic, as you well know. It's also been reduced to a 20 mile an hour speed limit. If you can now go to P14748. It's a bit difficult to see it. You might be able to see it a bit better on the next one, 739. Yes, you can see it better there. Here is the pedestrian controlled crossing going diagonally underneath the bridge. So, again, it's not a segregated footpath. It does not allow for the continued free flow of traffic, and that goes right through a part of the bridge, which, as you know, floods in heavy weather. I think we saw the picture of it on A1950(6).

421. Sorry, A1950(6). You don't have it. It's a picture of the bridge flooding, which you get with heavy rain. So you can't walk through there. It's just impractical. So we're very concerned about that as a proposal which doesn't meet the criteria they said they would be able to achieve, and these 20 mile limits and the controlled crossings will add to the congestion on the Breakspear Road. I'll briefly say we're disappointed that they are not willing to use West Ruislip. We thought that would be a way of getting material in and out by rail sooner, but there is obviously a need to rephrase the program to use rail much sooner for those purposes.

422. So those are basically our proposals. Let me just say in summary that we think the

siting of a major tunnel construction project like this in an area without direct access to the trunk road network is unfortunate in the extreme. If it had have been moved to West Hyde, these problems of congestion and air pollution would disappear. The addition of the haul road to avoid Harvil Road and Swakeleys Road is a very good idea. However, it should not exit on the Swakeleys roundabout, but only directly onto the A40, otherwise it is just going to cause more problems and more safety issues. The route replacement is much cheaper, would be quicker to build and it would not impact on local traffic at all. If we combine this with the immediate use of internal haul roads, Ickenham High Road would be saved, but, also, HS2 would not be subject to the programme delays that would be inevitable. So, those 73 lorries that we talked about joining the queue at Swakeleys roundabout are going to have to wait for more than 25 minutes, because it is 25 minutes when you get to the back of the queue. They are going to be stuck in there for an hour waiting to get through to their route. If they come directly off the A40, there are no delays at all. So this is a way that they can keep to their programme, as well as saving Ickenham from the devastating effects of the traffic in terms of road congestion and air pollution.

423. So, for the sake of the changes to the project plan, we think that the health of Ickenham residents and the livelihood of residents in the borough more widely should be put before the considerations of the project planners. So, as I say, we are looking for: a re-phasing of the programme to bring forward the use of rail; a rerouting of the haul road to the A40, specifically, when it is set on to spoil; and footpaths that do not go under the Chiltern line – Breakspear Road – railway bridge. We think that you should be directing HS2 to put the health and livelihoods of our residents before the needs and convenience of their project planners.

424. CHAIR: Okay. Mr Strachan?

425. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): P150031. First of all, could I just pick up the points made. The further transport assessment reflects an assurance that we agreed arising out of this Select Committee. You will see that we agreed to undertake a traffic assessment of a number of junctions, including Swakeleys Road roundabout. We had agreed to use reasonable levels to agree the traffic assumptions. We said that we would use a LinSig or other appropriate local junction traffic model and that we would provide the results to the highway authority for its review. If you carry on down, please, we had carried out

such a detailed traffic assessment at the request of the London Borough of Hillingdon. The Vsim micro simulation model of Swakeleys roundabout was extended and validated across a geographical area of interest to incorporate the junctions of concern. So we have used Vsim at the request of the highway authority. We used it to forecast the impacts. Over on page 2, you will see we have actually previously also done some LinSig modelling, and we will get to that in a moment. We liaised with Hillingdon and TfL during the development of the assessment work and we developed some mitigation options, which I have explained further. We are also carrying out sensitivity tests and are further developing those options.

426. Those are the scenarios I tested that I mentioned a moment ago. You can see at the bottom of the page: traffic signalling times were initially taken from earlier LinSig with modifications made to optimise and Vsim. Contrary to any impression you might have got, we have done LinSig modelling before. We have done Vsim at the request of Hillingdon and, over the page – I think there is one more page – sorry, carry on, please. I have shown you the results, but if you look at page 11: our conclusions, having done this modelling, are that partial signalisation would produce management benefits over the existing roundabout both with and without HS2. However, TfL are reviewing the Vsim model. They have given us their feedback and we are investigating the queries that they made, I think, last week, including the safety implications of option D2A and circulating Swakeleys roundabout. We will refine test and mitigation options as requested. That is work that is ongoing and, no doubt, we will provide our response to TfL and Hillingdon in light of that. Everything we have done has been in a collaborative way with TfL and Hillingdon, following their suggestions as to what further modelling should be done.

427. The second point raised is an assumption that the drives proposal, which is the one you heard about a moment ago, is safer and cheaper than what we are proposing. I am not going to repeat Mr Smart's evidence, but he is here again if you have got any more questions. He has made it perfectly clear that there are at least two fundamental difficulties with the A40 connection, the first of which is that physically to do the works would involve interfering with the A40, which itself will create a problem. There would also be a problem in terms of the timetable for the haul road's purpose, which is to bring in material to create the trace. That brings me onto my third point, which is that the

creation of the trace is part of the process by which we can then introduce haul roads for use along the wider parts of the scheme, as Mr Smart has explained. If we could put in haul roads earlier or reduce traffic on the roads, we would do it. But we are maximising as quickly as possible the introduction of haul roads on the trace where we can in order to minimise traffic on the roads because, of course, if there were an easier solution that reduced traffic on the roads, we would have no interest other than in pursuing it. That is clear from all the work we are doing.

428. Can I deal with the question of public rights of way? A question was raised about Breakspear Road South underpass. Can I just show you P14358(7)? This is one of the issues on which Hillingdon is satisfied, as you heard earlier. As we said we would, we developed options for the Breakspear Road South underpass, which is the one the residents are referring to. We developed them and we provided an assurance to the London Borough of Hillingdon, which is, of course, the body responsible for the safe footpath under that bridge. They have selected option 3. In paragraph 1.1, option 3 is the diagonal crossing under the bridge. They have selected that as being their preferred option. We will require – 1.2 – the nominated undertaker constructing those works to deal with the carriageway surface beneath the rail bridge, so it will be of appropriate surfacing and lit. We have said we will carry out a flood risk assessment of the impacts of the works north and south of the Chiltern lines, and we will deal with the issue of drainage and flooding impacts on the Breakspear Road south of the River Pinn. A flood risk assessment will be undertaken in consultation with the lead local flood authority and will identify reasonable drainage measures to seek to ensure that flooding will not hamper the safe movement of pedestrians at the Breakspear Road underpass. The nominated undertaker will be required to use reasonable endeavours to implement the measures identified within the flood risk assessment. So we have done, again, what we said we were going to do with the London Borough of Hillingdon. They are satisfied with that assurance.

429. The final issue was this: the idea of the haul road, which I mentioned earlier, is tied up with the process of constructing the trace. If you want any more details about that, I will ask Mr Smart to give evidence, but I think he has already addressed that on a number of occasions. The message is we are doing everything we can to reduce construction traffic in this area. The haul road is there to take it off Swakeleys Road and

Harvil Road. It has to come onto the A40, and we have identified what we believe, having done that further assessment work, is a safe signalisation of Swakeleys Road. But we will continue to work with TfL and Hillingdon to check that and to produce anything further that may be needed to produce such an efficient junction to get our traffic through.

430. CHAIR: Okay. Brief final comments, Mr Tizard?

431. MR TIZARD: Yes, as I say, the proposed haul road is considered unsafe by TfL. It is considered infeasible by us because of the fact that the proposals will not improve traffic flow. You will get increased congestion and tailbacks onto the A40. The timetable for producing the haul road proposed by the drive is going to be quicker. Even if you started off only with the access onto the north side of the road, it would, at least, give you the means of getting traffic directly off up to the site without having to join the queue going up to Swakeleys Road. If you needed to, you could do the slick going back onto the A40 going west at a later date – it could be delayed – but you could do it almost straightaway.

432. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Most of the traffic leaving the site, is it going to go westwards or eastwards on the A40 – westwards, isn't it?

433. MR TIZARD: Yeah.

434. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: So if it came off the A40, it would immediately go up onto the Swakeleys roundabout, go three quarters of the way around it – actually, all the way round it – and come back?

435. MR TIZARD: Yeah, but that is what it would have to do if it came out on the proposed haul route.

436. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: It does not make any difference then does it to the roundabout.

437. MR TIZARD: Except that you could, with the drive proposal, follow that on with an exit onto the westbound.

438. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: If you got underneath the road –

439. MR TIZARD: Well, underneath the road is already there.

440. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: And then back on.

441. MR TIZARD: You could build that a lot quicker – because there are all sorts of problems with building a haul road along the golf course. It is low; it is prone to flooding; there is more infill. You have already got a railway track there ready to take it and you do not have to do any work to it. It is going to –

442. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: That is not the time taken building a road.

443. CHAIR: Anyway, thank you very much, Mr Tizard. Thank you very much to Ickenham residents. It was nice to see you again. We now move onto AP4209. Brian Cable, is that you?

Brian Cable

444. MR CABLE: Good evening. It has obviously been quite a long day. I feel a bit like somebody who has arrived late at a party and all that is left to look at are chewed-over egg and cress sandwiches and a glass of warm Sauterne.

445. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: We don't have egg and cress.

446. MR CABLE: Yes, we did not have that privilege. I will try to be brief. I have some points to pick up that affect purely us on Harvil Road. Although I put in a petition myself this time, I did so with the blessing of the people who live at the south end of Harvil Road, which is currently up on the map there. There are about 25/26 houses that extend up to Harvil Farm, which you heard about earlier. What goes on on Harvil Road has quite an impact on the rest of Ickenham. If we can move to 20161, please. I am not going to go through this, but, as you can see from this, we have a huge industrial site. It extends further north than it shows on the map, up to South Harefield. We have various descriptions of how many HGVs we are going to have going down the road every day – 30, 60, 1,000, 550 a day five and a half days a week. We are still not sure; we have no idea.

447. If you could move onto number 2, please. You will have seen a similar slide last Wednesday from Mr Adams from Breakspear Road South. That is the view that we have

at the moment. What you cannot see is, if you were slightly elevated, we have a fantastic view across London as well. The bottom picture shows what we anticipate, with 3 meters of spoil. If HS2 follow Sir Peter's suggestion from Wednesday last that it is all dumped at the Harvil Road end rather than the Breakspear South end, I suspect it might be higher – para 122 if you need a reference, Sir.

448. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Start there and work towards Breakspear Road.

449. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): That was the point you made: when you start placing material, you start close to the site. It is only if you needed to go further that you would move further from the site.

450. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: I think that is a fair summary.

451. MR CABLE: I did not think you would be so sensitive about it.

452. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: I am just trying to show understanding.

453. MR CABLE: Really, we do not have a clue what is going to happen on that area. I say this because, at the AP4 meeting last October, I asked Mr O'Riordan to explain why the AP4 diagram showed both permanent placement and temporary storage on those fields. He said, 'Well, that's likely to happen' – 'likely' was the word. He also confirmed that the height would – could – be above 3 meters to an unspecified height for the temporary storage. They gave no guarantees about the removal. It was all work in progress with vague promises that the dumping could be removed. We have gone no further than that.

454. Could we go onto 20163 please? This is just a reminder of the Harvil Road traffic. It is a country lane, basically, carrying urban levels of traffic. There are 9,000 light goods vehicles and cars every day. We already have about 850 HGVs, including a huge amount of activity from skip laying. The fuel depot has just got a new licence to bring in an additional 100 tankers. That brings it up to 950. With HS2, we have 30, 60, 960, 550 – we still do not know. I am a bit disappointed because every time we have mentioned the existing rate of HGVs on Harvil Road, as Mr O'Riordan, again, said: 'It's probably just background.' It has not been taken into account, so you cannot take into account the full impact. I only want to use this to make a point why a haul road would be of huge

benefit to people on Harvil Road. It would take 100s of HGVs off the road.

455. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Whichever haul road –

456. MR CABLE: Sorry?

457. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Whichever haul road it is would help Harvil Road?

458. MR CABLE: Yes, whichever haul road it is. I am not going to enter any more into discussion on the haul road – you have probably had a stomach full of that today – but the big point as far as we are concerned is: we are realists. We know full well that it will not work unless the traffic problems in Ickenham are sorted out, particularly those around Swakeleys Roundabout. That is an issue that still gives us great cause for concern.

459. Can we go onto number 4 please? This is the overall impact of HS2 on Harvil Road. AP4 so far has not given us any confidence that anything will change. I am not going to go through it; you have heard so much about this sort of thing before. Moving onto five, you are probably wondering why I slipped this slide in here. It is to introduce my concerns about Uxbridge golf course. I have to confess that I, regrettably, have some personal knowledge of golf management in golf clubs. I actually ran three golf clubs over a period of eight years, so I do understand a bit about the golf industry. I also understand about many of the practical and safety issues of running a golf course. As other people have said, the concerns about Uxbridge golf course have to be seen in the context of the losses of other community assets. I am very disappointed in the attitude that has been taken towards Uxbridge golf course. Reducing Uxbridge golf course to a course that is fitted in behind 25 metre high fences 500-600 meters long is not a solution that will work. They are doing it because of safety issues. The safety issues will still be there because a fence that high and that long will not stay up in a high wind. Fences have been put up as temporary measures on golf courses all around the country. Anybody who knows about these flimsy wire fences knows that they are great for about 10 minutes then you get a 30 mile an hour wind and half of them are gone. The maintenance is difficult and impractical. The only practical solution would be to reduce Uxbridge golf course down to a short par 3 nine-hole course, which was also offered as an option. To be perfectly honest, as other people have said, that is not a viable solution.

460. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: How long has the driving range been on the A3, just south of –

461. MR CABLE: Sorry?

462. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: How long has that golf driving range by the A3 been there?

463. MR CABLE: I am not familiar with it.

464. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: I think the answer is 20 years. Their fences are much, much higher than what is being proposed here.

465. MR CABLE: I bet it is not several meters long.

466. MR HENDRICK: There is one at the end of my road which is very high, indeed – it has been there years.

467. MR CABLE: If you put them all around a golf course, then, believe me, they need a lot of maintenance.

468. MR HENDRICK: This is a golf driving range.

469. MR CABLE: A golf driving range is a very, very constrained area compared to a golf course. That is a difference. It is an issue, and the safety problem does not go away because balls can fly over a 25 meter fence – believe me, I have seen some people with slices that go into orbit. I am just a bit concerned. There is a practical solution to this: to close Uxbridge golf course and compensate people for it, but, of course, nobody really wants that. There is quite a strong case for having it reinstated as an 18-hole course, which was mentioned by Mr Pibworth. If you used, as the planning consent originally was for, about 150,000 cubic meters, which is roughly 300,000 tonnes of spoil to improve the levels and change the contours of the golf course down to the south end in the redundant holes, that is 16,000 truckloads approximately. 16,000 truckloads, if HS2 were dumping it at commercial rates, is probably £1.6 million. So there must be some offset from HS2's point of view that might actually be a viable option. I am not an expert; I am just saying that perhaps they should look at it a little bit more kindly. In view of the fact that there are no economic benefits to Ickenham, I consider that the

offer of £3.3 million to compensate the community is just down right insulting.

470. So we have a huge number of uncertainties still existing despite AP4. We hear lots of expressions: ‘all motherhood and apple pie,’ ‘work in progress,’ ‘in process of development,’ ‘subject to requirements of the programme,’ ‘statements of ambition.’ Nothing positive at all has come out after two years. We are still in a state of complete uncertainty for the whole community. For us who live on Harvil Road, the prospects of the next few years are absolutely horrifying and we have had no reassurances on anything at all because we cannot be convinced that even the proposals under AP4, as they might seem superficially attractive, will actually work. Whenever we actually get an offer or a suggestion that things might improve, the caveats come out. They talk about: ‘Reduce any adverse environmental aspects caused by the proposed scheme in so far as these mitigation measures do not add unreasonable costs of the project or unreasonable delays to the construction programme.’ So we have very, very little confidence in what is being assured by HS2 so far.

471. I shall go onto my final slide. This is what we are asking for. We have heard and seen enough comment to know that perhaps there are problems with the existing programme. It could be and should be adjusted to reduce the overall impact on Ickenham. We are still waiting for the development of a credible and robust traffic plan that is fit for purpose. I have listened to everything today and, hopefully, something along those lines will be developed fairly shortly. Out of that, we would also like some clear targets for maximum daily HGV movements over local roads. I will not go through the rest because they have all been said before, but there is one thing: there is absolutely no reason why all the spoil in Ickenham should not be removed in due course – only the absolute minimum should be left. Once the rail sidings are up and running, there is no reason why the soil should not be carted away until it is all gone, even if it takes until 2035 or something like that. That is something we would look for and, hopefully, we will get some reassurances on those issues before you finish your study.

472. CHAIR: Right, thank you Mr Cable. Mr Strachan?

473. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Just with those points in mind, can I just show you P153482? The assurance we have provided to Hillingdon you will see requires us – or the nominated undertaker – ‘to engage actively with TfL and the council on a study to

reduce HGV movements in the Ickenham area during the construction and, in carrying out the study in accordance with the brief, the study would include but not be limited to a number of proposals maximising as far as reasonably practical the volume of excavated and construction material to be removed by rail, changes to the grading through the cutting etc.’ I am not going to read them all out, but can I just show you the brief in appendix A of the same letter, which comes at the end on the next page. You will see that, as part of the brief, we have actually identified for the study objectives or aspirations that largely echo what the petitioners have been talking about. Can I just show the full page – sorry, just up a bit: ‘Seeking to achieve a target on the maximum number of vehicle movements’ – 2A – and an explanation of how that might be done. ‘Sequencing of construction’ is this bullet point down here and then, further down, ‘measures to improve traffic flow and highway safety at the affected roads and junctions...look at sustainable placement sites...assess how much SP sites can be reduced.’ Then, 10: ‘how current sites can be better used...how material can used...and agreed project milestones.’ These are already reflected in this brief that there is going to be further work done with TfL and the London Borough of Hillingdon.

474. Can I just cover the point about the changes in AP4? They are, in fact, to reduce the amount of material that is stored in the area, as you have already heard. I am not going to repeat it, but the figures are that, for permanent sustainable placement, we had a maximum height of 3 meters. The idea is to reduce the amount of sustainable placement that takes place in the Harvil Road area, as we have indicated, by taking more material out by rail in accordance with the aspirations I have just identified. Temporary stock piling is, I think, up to a maximum of 5 meters. However, the whole point about temporary stock piling is it is there in order to assist with the removal of material, so that it does not stay there on a permanent basis. So, you store it temporarily and then you take it off by the rail head or –

475. CHAIR: Or by traffic on the roads.

476. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Indeed. That is a management measure. That is why AP4 reflects temporary stockpiling: because it is there to mitigate the effect on the road. I do not want to go back over the golf course. I made the point that our golf course proposal is one that has been drawn up by our own professional, including the use of safety netting. I think a proposal has been put forward by this petitioner that you might

be able to use some of your materials on the golf course as part of restoration of that site. I know, on the one hand, that they are also asking for all materials to be taken off site, but, subject to that tension, there is certainly no reason why we could not discuss with the London Borough of Hillingdon who own that site as part of the golf course whether they do, in fact, want to have more materials as part of the restoration of the site. That is not something they have previously sought with us and, no doubt, it is controversial in other respects. However, we are certainly amenable to have those discussions if that is an aspiration of the community and, indeed, the London Borough of Hillingdon.

477. MR HENDRICK: Will the idea be to get back to an 18-hole site?

478. MR CABLE: Sorry?

479. MR HENDRICK: Will the idea be to get back to an 18-hole site?

480. MR CABLE: Yes, because there is a huge amount of flooding on the lower areas of the course. There was a plan and a design that used about 135,000 cubic meters and involved raising the levels, adjusting the contours on the south end to improve play, creating better landing areas on some of the holes off the tee shots and raising the level of the lower holes to a point of about 1.5 meters maximum, which would improve the drainage and it had all been – met all the requirements of Natural England, so it is – there is a plan and I’m sure somewhere in the Council, there will still be designs that will do it. I’m sure...

481. MR HENDRICK: Well, in that case, isn’t something that’s considered a problem, i.e. large amounts of spoil, can it not be compacted....

482. MR CABLE: Well, I’m just trying to – I was – I was just suggesting it as an imaginative way of – you know, some spoil is going to be left on the field...

483. MR HENDRICK: About three metres of it.

484. MR CABLE: But if you can take 300,000 tonnes of it and use it usefully, locally, to actually give some local benefit, it also means that HS2 won’t have to haul it away.

485. CHAIR: Had you finished, Mr Strachan?

486. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Well, I'll just continue; so, in principle, that's a discussion that the London Borough of Hillingdon would like to have with us, we will have that discussion. What we have proposed, in terms of the golf course, is a solution for the golf course which allows it to continue to operate, albeit as a nine hole golf course, during the construction period, with the remodelling work we propose, because that's a seven year period when the haul road is in operation and a year either side to construct it. That is our – what we say can be done for the sum of money we put forward as part of our suggestion.

487. If the London Borough of Hillingdon have different aspirations for the golf course and their other golf course, that's equally as a sum that could have been used as part of that global pot. I don't want to re-open that debate, but I'm just indicating that this is something that we had already...

488. MR HENDRICK: Would you be willing to not consider a monetary value of that spoil, and get into discussions, maybe with Hillingdon, and the Golf Club, and a possible 18-hole course in the future, using that spoil?

489. MR CABLE: Well, I'm just putting it...

490. MR HENDRICK: No, I'm talking to Mr Strachan.

491. MR CABLE: Sorry.

492. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I've already indicated, we're happy to continue our discussions with the London Borough of Hillingdon. And then, I think the final –

493. CHAIR: Are you trying to read your own handwriting or somebody else's?

494. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): No, I've got a note which I couldn't read, I think it's my failing eyesight at this time of day. A2016(6), if you could just pop that on screen. Just to come back to this. If one looks at it in the context of the brief I've already indicated in terms of general aspirations, while we're not giving these undertakings in this precise form, you'll see we've already encapsulated many of the things in what I've already shown you.

495. CHAIR: Okay. Brief final comments, Mr Cable?

496. MR CABLE: Yes, thank you for letting me talk to you again, particularly as it's so late, but there is just one – and I can't put it quite as eloquently as perhaps Nick Hurd said, but we in Ickenham and Hillingdon are depending on you gentlemen, to help us. We've no other recourse to any other source of support. You're coming to the end of your trials on HS2 after two years, but we are faced with the prospect of 10 years more of disruption, chaos, damage to our countryside and community. And if there's anything you can do in your final report that will help to alleviate that, we'd be very grateful.

497. And I have one personal point to make, is that my wife and I have very, very little confidence that things will improve. And we are in the process of looking for somewhere else to live. We've lived here for 25 years, and we now feel that with what's due to come, we're being driven out of our home, and we have a lot to put up with.

498. CHAIR: Were you RAF or British Airways?

499. MR CABLE: Sorry?

500. CHAIR: Were you British Airways?

501. MR CABLE: Good heavens no, sir, I was a wing commander in the Royal Air Force.

502. CHAIR: Wing commander, that's what I thought you said to me. Vulcans?

503. MR CABLE: Sorry?

504. CHAIR: Vulcans?

505. MR CABLE: Vulcans? You have a fantastic memory.

506. CHAIR: Yes, I thought you were Vulcans. Means you've been to Lincolnshire.

507. MR HENDRICK: There's only one left.

508. MR CABLE: Even that's not flying anymore. If you go to the RAF museum, there's one in the corner of the RAF museum and I flew that on many occasions.

509. CHAIR: Well, thank you very much, thank you. Right, we now go to AP4: 241

London Wildlife Trust. Hello, welcome.

London Wildlife Trust

510. MR FRITH: Good evening Chair, and members of the Committee. My name is Matthew Frith and I work for the London Wildlife Trust and this is the first time that we've appeared before the Committee for an issue which I'm sure has been familiar with you for most of this afternoon.

511. The Trust was established in 1981 and our charitable objectives are to manage nature reserves, the conservation of wildlife across Greater London, to promote public engagement with, understanding of, and appreciations of the natural world and to campaign in support of sustainable principles and practices for the protection of the natural environment.

512. We manage 42 nature reserves across Greater London, a few more coming on stream and we work beyond our nature reserves to promote our objects throughout Greater London, recognised by London local authorities as an advisor on ecological issues, including, for example, wildlife sites. We have over 15,000 members and 800 active volunteers, many of whom live and work in the area that will be affected by the construction and operation of the railway authorised by the Bill.

513. We manage Frays Farm Meadows SSSI on a 25 year lease in the London Borough of Hillingdon, which is due to expire in 2026. We also manage the adjacent Denham Lock Wood SSSI, also on a similar lease, which is shown on the map at the moment.

514. Both sites have been managed by ourselves since 1999 and both are publicly accessible with within a large statutory Frays Valley local nature reserve, which is indicated on some other maps. Both reserves are subject to a 10 year high level stewardship scheme which we work and report to Natural England, which is due to cease in 2021 and which has enabled us, in some ways, to further our conservation objectives at both reserves.

515. However, the proposals within the Additional Provisions 4 for a temporary haulage road would lead to significant direct and indirect adverse impacts on sites as a result and will also directly, and adversely affect us in terms of our ability to manage the

reserves. So, if we turn to map A19991.

516. This shows Frays Farm Meadows in green, the route of the haulage road. The direct impact on the nature reserve and the SSSI in the dark red. What's not shown on the map is Denham Lock Wood which is the kind of wooded triangle on the left hand side, next to the Frays river, so that complete parcel is land under our management.

517. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: That's the bit the other side of the disused railway?

518. MR FRITH: That's right, yes.

519. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): The plan we had up at the beginning shows the two together.

520. MR FRITH: That's right, yeah.

521. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): These are both SSSIs. I think, and you'll correct me if I'm wrong, the whole area, this area, is a SSSI, but you don't actually manage this section, the path through it? Although it is part of the designated...

522. MR FRITH: Yeah, the strip is not in the nature reserve. But it's within the SSSI as I understand it.

523. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): No – yes.

524. MR FRITH: And also, there's a part of the nature reserve which is on the farm left of Frays Farm Meadows which is not in the SSSI, so it's a bit of a complication but fundamentally, the haulage road, as proposed, would affect a significant part of the reserve, about 0.3 hectares, possibly up to 0.6, depending on the exact alignment of the haulage road, will be lost and the concern for us, is that this particular part of the reserve is predominantly consists of having all these sedge beds and wet grassland, which is the critical determinant of the Site of Specialist Scientific Interest.

525. It's notified for its national rarity and important competition with plants and associated invertebrates and are providing a wintering ground for birds such as snipe. We think it contains the largest extent of sedge beds in Greater London, and for us, it is one of our most important nature reserves, so out of our 42, this is probably in the top three or four.

526. In addition to the sedges and grassland, neighbouring hedgerows, small patches of willow, blackthorn scrub will also be lost, three wet ditch lines will be intercepted by the road and some tree lines along the boundary of Frays Farm Meadows and the golf course may need to be removed to accommodate the road. Some trees will inevitably require removal. If we go to map 19992, we will see where we have shown the most important elements of vegetation on that side of the nature reserve, so we're not looking at anywhere else on this map, but directly and very closely, indirectly, impacted by the haulage road.

527. So, we've got a mixture of sedge fen, wet grassland and we've got this ancient woodland which is outside the nature reserve and in the golf course.

528. The meadows support one of the London's' most important water vole populations. Now, this mammal is one of the fastest declining nature mammal in the UK and subject to a lot of conservation focus by us and many other organisations around the country. It's been a particular focus for our work over the last 19 years.

529. The site also supports other – several species of what are known as amber and red listed bird species, so they are in decline, including linnet, red kite, kingfisher, kestrel, grasshopper warbler, bullfinch and barn owl. And rather surprisingly, it also supports a regionally important population of glow-worms. So if you move to map A191993, we will see some of the species impacts, or presence of, so we've got the blue stipple, is where the water voles are found in the ditches, the yellow is the glowing glow worms, and we manage two sites which have glow worms, the purple little strip is what we know as a roosting area for barn owl, right in the middle of the haulage road route. We know that badgers forage on that part of the site and it is also an area of wintering forage areas for snipe, just to the west of the haulage road. Again, in one of the sedge beds.

530. Again, as before, the previous map, this doesn't look at the other species impacts in other parts of the site.

531. So, we are concerned that the impacts could be significant, in terms of their damage on the ecological value of the nature reserve, and that has been recognised by the promoter.

532. I would like to also then turn on to the other element of our concern which is our

ability to manage the site. At the moment, the road would completely block our ability to access the predominant part of the Frays Farm Meadow site and manage it for at least nine years. This includes the movement on and off of stock and machinery.

533. Whilst much management of our nature reserves involves a significant contribution of volunteers, in the case of Frays Farm Meadows, the nature of the site and the habit requirements means that our interventions require machinery, the input of specialist staff, contractors, and livestock. And we primarily access both reserves, both here and Denham Lock Wood, via a track through Uxbridge Golf Course, through a gate that falls right within the area identified by the haulage road.

534. So, if we go to map 19994, we will see our key areas for accessing the site. E1 is our main portal of access, so you can see, we come down the existing track that has been described already this afternoon, into the reserve, that allows us to bring machinery, and then two smaller entrances, E2, which is right off the slip road on the A40, which we have to get permission from the adjacent landowner, allows through the little bit here, and then E3, which is coming in from the north, which really you can only access if we're carrying small handheld tools.

535. We have probably secured funding – well, we've secured funding in over £200,000 in the last 15 years to manage the site and to make sure they are continuing towards favourable conditions status, as required by Natural England. When we took them on, they were in unfavourable condition, and we are confident that if we can continue our regimes of management, that they will be in favourable condition within the next five or six years.

536. However, with this inability to access the site, it will effectively prevent us from managing the reserve for up to nine years. And not only will that prevent us from doing the works that we've been enjoying for the last 15 years, it will undermine the works that we've done to date because nature moves on. These sites require intensive management, they require grazing, they require cutting and removal of plant material, so if we can't get onto the site, they will start to deteriorate and we have provided, in our evidence, some indication of what those costs are likely to be, from what we know at this moment in time.

537. In conclusion, the proposed haulage route was not based on comprehensive

information. There were no surveys done on site, it was done from aerial photographs and existing maps, rather than talking to us. The Trust considers its route, scale and operational scope, as well as the stockpile areas and their adverse impacts on Frays Farm Meadows SSSI and Denham Lock Wood SSSI will lead to an irrecoverable loss of a nationally important habitat and compromise the positive conservation of habitats that we've undertaken on the same site since 1999.

538. And we would ask the Committee to seek for the haulage route to be withdrawn from impacting, directly and indirectly, on, not only Frays Farm Meadows and Denham Lock Wood SSSI. And I'd like to take this opportunity that the other proposals that we've heard this afternoon, would actually increase the negative impacts on both SSSIs.

539. At the moment, prior to AP4 coming through, HS2 adversely impacts, from what I understand, two SSSIs on the whole route, which is pretty commendable in some ways. One of those is in London. AP4 increases that to another SSSI, any alternations into a route to the west of the current proposal would increase that to four SSSIs being adversely impacted on the scheme.

540. However, we completely understand other petitioners' concerns over the haulage route, and how it may affect their lives. For us, it is the management of the nature reserves and it is for the future condition of those nationally important habitats and species which we work so hard to achieve. Thank you

541. CHAIR: Thank you for being brief. Mr Strachan?

542. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes, could I show you P15343(1). This is an assurance we provided to the Wildlife Trust which, I understand, the petitioner has seen, in discussions with Natural England and the Wildlife Trust – you need to go to the next page, please, too, you'll see that we've sought to address the concerns that have been raised. First of all, we've agreed we'll do an ecological survey of Pinnocks Wood...

543. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: That's the bit you're talking about – which we've been talking about earlier on?

544. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Exactly, that's the bit that just lies on the edge of the SSSI.

545. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: The ancient, or not so ancient woodland might be a better sacrifice than being in the SSSI?

546. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Precisely. Our current understanding is that – and if I’ve got this wrong, the petitioner will tell me, certainly that the ancient woodland which we are seeking to avoid as a result of comments from Natural England originally, we now understand, the greater emphasis would be avoiding the SSSI areas and I think that’s common ground with the Wildlife Trust, so that if this proposal were to go ahead, it would be better to look at putting it into the ancient woodland along an existing track.

547. And so that’s the purpose of the woodland survey identified in paragraph 1. It is subject to getting access rights, I think, from the London Borough of Hillingdon. And we will obviously then engage with the relevant affected parties at paragraph 2. And then paragraph 3, translates into the obligation to try and reduce the impacts of the haul road on the Frays Farm Meadow SSSI and seek to try and move the alignment of the haul road out of that part of the SSSI into the ancient woodlands area.

548. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Is the landowner Hillingdon?

549. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Indeed. As I understand it. Yes.

550. MR HENDRICK: So, you swap it for the least worst option?

551. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): We’re looking for the least worst option and certainly, you can see, I think from the petitioner’s slide itself, that PA199(1). We already had sought to avoid the SSSI with the location of the haul road, which is why it went on this dog leg. The only pinch point was in this area, the dark red which is the Frays Farm SSSI and we were there seeking to avoid the ancient woodland, but as a result of those discussions and the assurance, the idea is subject to getting those consents and surveys that we would seek to try and move it across to avoid the SSSI concern.

552. And that’s the purpose – if we could go back to the obligations that we were putting forward in our assurance. And we have identified in four that it’s subject to any planning permission that may be required to move it, and dealing with any conditions that are imposed on it. It does require some cooperation, I think in part, from the London Borough of Hillingdon because we need, in order to carry out that survey work,

we would need their agreement to do the work, and as yet, that's dependent on Royal Assent, but we're quite keen to do the work in advance as appropriate.

553. CHAIR: Okay.

554. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: But if there isn't agreement, you'll have to go ahead with what you're proposing?

555. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Indeed. And I'm not going to repeat anything I've said.

556. CHAIR: Alright. Well there seems to be a plan to try and improve things. Brief final comment?

557. MR FRITH: Yes, well we met the promoter on Friday to go through this, so this arrived on Thursday evening. Yes, there are concerns about whether this will actually be achieved. We do believe that the SSSI was not really understood in terms of the original AP4 proposal. I would hate to try and define comparing apples with pears in terms of that grassland and sedge beds, and ancient woodland, but we do know that that woodland needs looking at, I think, to make a fair assessment of what the road proposal would be. We are reassured, to some extent, in terms of the access issue, which is part of the letter of assurance...

558. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I've just put that up on screen now.

559. MR FRITH: Because that is fundamental for us maintaining the rest of the site, and we are committed to working with all partners on trying to ensure that we can continue that. In terms of restoration, there are concerns that the route goes through a very wet part of the site, I mean the very wet parts, that part of Frays Farm Meadows can be about half a metre under water. So, the kind of engineering requirements, to maintain that road are going to have impacts on the hydrology of the nature reserve, so there is a lot of work that we would like to be reassured that that could be not only minimised, the adverse impacts be minimised, but that restoration goes well beyond what we've got at the moment.

560. CHAIR: Okay, right. Thank you very much indeed, and no doubt, discussions will continue. Right, we now move onto 367, Denham Water Ski Club. Is that you

again Mr Briggs?

Denham Water Ski Club

561. MR BRIGGS: Yes. I'll try and be very brief.

562. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I've put up what I hope's the most helpful plan. The Denham Water Ski Club is here. I know you've heard about this before, but the viaduct is running behind the Water Ski Club and they use the lake in front...

563. CHAIR: Yes, we understood that, some of us.

564. MR BRIGGS: Mr Chairman, I'd like to actually do this petition jointly with Ivydrive Limited, and I have to my right, Mr Robin Allen, who is the – Ivydrive Limited are the freeholder of the site, of which Denham Water Ski Club operate. Mr Allen is the major shareholder of Ivydrive Limited and also runs Denham Water Ski Club, so I thought it would be appropriate for him to be there. So, he has an interest in both camps.

565. CHAIR: Okay.

566. MR BRIGGS: If we first of all go to A20121, please. This shows the extent of Ivydrive Limited's property there, outlined in red, and if we go to the next slide, what I've tried to do is to break it down into three parts. Number one is what's known as Korda Lake, which is leased to the Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust but the main block of the lake is actually fished by the British Carp Study Group, who have a very significant amount of carp in the lake and the significance of that, we'll come onto later.

567. If we then go onto the second...

568. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Is this carp study as in Japanese carp or is this?

569. MR ALLEN: No these are serious carp anglers. You pay before you can join the British Carp Study Group. You have to be a recognised carp fisherman for the last, at least 15 years, so they're quite an exclusive group.

570. MR HENDRICK: So it's like the Japanese –

571. MR ALLEN: Well these are 50 pounds, so a bit bigger than Japanese ones.

572. MR BRIGGS: I think there are some very large tench in there as well.
573. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Okay. And they get returned? They get returned or taken home?
574. MR ALLEN: No not ours, they go back in. Some of these carp are worth five or £6,000 each.
575. MR BRIGGS: And weigh up to 50 pounds in weight.
576. MR HENDRICK: They pull them out and then chuck them back in.
577. MR BRIGGS: The next slide, which is number three shows a separate area of Battlesford Wood which is ancient woodland and that's an area that's not particularly utilised in the same way that the other two parts are. And the third slide, sorry, number four, which is the next slide, this is the area occupied by the Water Ski Club, and I feel it's useful for you all to understand the context of that. The Water Ski Club is probably the most affected by the scheme, but this is the extent of the ownership and the three separate parts.
578. Now, I did submit a video to – an overhead one, showing the whole of site, I'm not sure if you've got that. Could we see that, please?
579. MR HENDRICK: How long is it?
580. MR BRIGGS: Sorry?
581. MR HENDRICK: How long is it?
582. MR ALLEN: Oh, it's only a minute and a half, if that.
583. [Video shown]
584. MR BRIGGS: This is effectively showing the main block in number three of the Water Ski Club, you just see that on the right hand side, and we're coming from basically a north-south direction. We're going down to the junction where, the point between three and two are. And you'll appreciate the lake is ideal for the purpose that it's used. It's heavily wooded but it's long and thin and it's particularly well suited.

585. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Is this from a drone?

586. MR ALLEN: To be honest, we were going to play this at the end, there's another drone footage. But it gives you a flavour of what the site's like, and also a flavour of what we actually do.

587. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Is it filmed from a helicopter or from a drone?

588. MR ALLEN: From a drone. A young lady who put it together, and sent it through.

589. MR HENDRICK: Do the neighbours complain about the music?

590. MR ALLEN: If we stop it and then you can see again, the site.

591. MR BRIGGS: And the wooded area around it and the greenery. Could we then go to the next slide, number – I think it's number six, please? This is a plan where I've superimposed the route of the trace going through what I thought was probably more helpful than some of the plans the promoter has produced because I think it shows in context. And you'll see in the southern part, the Korda Lake is split right down the middle by the main route, and then it comes up through the edge of Battlesford wood and then runs parallel to the main club house of the Water Ski Club.

592. If we just look at the – initially deal with Korda Lake to begin with, the concern that we have is that although there's a lease to the Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust, the anglers potentially here, when the owners have a particular relationship, are very exposed to these proposals to put forward big structures through the middle of the lake to build the railway and we've seen nothing so far, from HS2 as to how this will be dealt with and how the fish will be protected, will they be – will the lake be drained, will the fish be relocated? We've seen nothing on that so far, despite asking questions of the same. And this does – there was a particular comment earlier where I think someone made a reference to, 'We're not in the business of closing down fishing lakes, but there is a big concern here.'

593. CHAIR: Okay.

594. MR HENDRICK: How many fish are in there?

595. MR ALLEN: I don't know in terms of numbers, but the anglers tell me that the value of the fish is something in the region of around £80,000-90,000. There are a lot of specimen fish in there. I am not an angler, but apparently there are some very nice tench as well, which are just underneath the British record. Obviously they have quite a valuable stock, which they have built up, actually, over a period of 18 years. They've been there a long time; it's not as though they've suddenly arrived there.

596. MR BRIGGS: This is a major concern to us. That is the first part of our concerns. The second thing is mainly in relation to the water-ski club itself. Probably the best slide to go to is number – I'm just trying to find the right number – 12, 2012(12), please.

597. At the moment you'll see that, ignoring our proposal, which is on the right-hand side, the club house, which is the black dot here, is very close to the trace. The amenity areas around the clubhouse are very exposed, not only during the construction phase but the use thereafter. If we got to the next slide, please, it'll give you an illustration of a photograph of the clubhouse taken from the water. You'll see the backdrop of it. The road is behind those trees, but you'll see it's very sheltered; it's down in a dip; it's right next to the lake. On a sunny day like this, there's no better place to be.

598. CHAIR: Except Committee Room 5.

599. MR BRIGGS: Well, it depends. If I then go on to slide 2012(18), please, you'll see that this gives a better illustration of the issues of the clubhouse. The clubhouse, here, is coloured in red. It's the red block there. This was the initial plan showing the haul road and then there was subsequent plan, which is the lower one, showing the haul road was moved back. Originally the haul road was approximately 6 metres from the edge of the clubhouse and it's now a fraction over 10 metres – so it's fairly close. Now, the relevance of that is that the brown area, as shown, is the tarmacked car-park area, which has 32 spaces. In addition, there is a grass car-park area which has another 120 spaces.

600. MR ALLEN: 100-plus, yes.

601. MR BRIGGS: It's something in that sort of region. The club has 80 full members. With juniors and off-peak, there are 100 members. The way the club runs is

that members book times to take a ride. You can probably explain it better than I can.

602. MR ALLEN: Yes, we operate a two-tier system. As a member you can actually book a timed ski slot up to two weeks ahead. Guests can also ski by phoning in or booking online up to three days ahead. That's the way we work. Each session is actually a timed session. We normally start from nine o'clock in the morning and we'll run through until nine o'clock at night – depending on the day.

603. MR BRIGGS: It's very dependent that people come a) because of the way it's operated and b) because it is quiet and tranquil, as you've seen from the video – apart from the music. The other main activity the club operates is this free swimming. There are 200 swimmers at any one time.

604. MR ALLEN: Yes, we can have up to 100 swimmers. This has grown massively over the last couple of years, really. In particular, we are frequented by Hillingdon Triathletes Club as well. They've got a lot of members, and they run a couple of competitions from there. It's boosted the ski-club revenues over the last couple of years, which is great. We open our doors and welcome them. It also means the usage of the site is quite extensive. It's used by a lot of people who enjoy the facilities.

605. MR BRIGGS: The Promoter has a good slide, 1507(0). I don't know whether we can go to that, please. This shows some subsequent discussions we've had with HS2, where they've endeavoured to increase the parking spaces by the black cross-hatching, going into the lake itself – but you'll see the proximity of the club itself is very close. That's where the 10.61 metres is. Again, the brown area is the tarmacked area.

606. The reality is that the club will not function during the construction period or thereafter. The impact of the scheme, as such, is that membership will die away; the swimmers will go. If one looks at the pink areas of land-take, you'll see that it's right on the edge of the clubhouse. If the club is to survive, which it wants to, because of the unique nature of the property, it needs to relocate. The whole point of coming to you today, Mr Chairman, is to discuss that relocation and to gain this Committee's support in that respect.

607. If I go back to the slide we produced, number 2012(14), this shows our proposals

in respect of where we wish to move the clubhouse from the western bank, if I'm getting my coordinates right, to the eastern bank and to take advantage of the access road which HS2 are intending to construct, which is the blue line running up to the top north-western corner, and then extend that access road across the northern boundary into the area – and reform the islands that Mr Allen constructed in the first place when he first came to the water ski club some 20 years ago.

608. MR ALLEN: Yes, we opened in 1997.

609. MR BRIGGS: It's important. Those blobs that look like an animal footprint were all man-made by Mr Allen. This was an old gravel pit.

610. CHAIR: Okay, how deep is it here?

611. MR ALLEN: It varies in depth, but in general terms it's between 3-4 metres. It's not that deep.

612. MR BRIGGS: If the clubhouse is relocated to this location, we feel that the club can continue. The membership will be able to –

613. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: It will get you away from the works.

614. MR BRIGGS: It will get us away from the works and still provide the key, which is the water, but without the interference of the work, the noise, the dust and everything else that goes with it. That's the key – and that's the main principle of why we're here today. I could talk about it at length. I know time is tight, but that's the principle.

615. There's one other issue we would like to raise, which goes back to the Promoter's slide – which one was it? – 1507(0). We have concerns that the haul road, which is yellow, is staying on the eastern side of the trace – or on the top of the trace is probably a better way to describe it – all the way along that route.

616. Now, we accept that there is not enough room for the haul road to be below the trace, between the A412 and the works, but, where we get to about here, running back this way, we think there is a good case to realign the haul road to the western boundary or to the bottom – mainly because of the marsh ground, the wet ground and the woodland that is being affected at the top. I think that's pretty much it.

617. MR ALLEN: At the moment, the route of the haul road, where it is at the present time, is going to demolish some more woodland which is right by the tip of the lake. It also means that, if we're operating on the lake, we've got the road next to us again – even on that stretch. Whereas, there is more of an argument to put it underneath the viaduct and run it to the west side of it. HS2 weren't happy about that for some reason. But, to be honest, if you see the route, it'll destroy a lot of woodland anyway.

618. CHAIR: Okay. Your final point, Mr Briggs?

619. MR BRIGGS: They're the points. We can talk about particular points, but I think that's pretty much it.

620. CHAIR: Those are the three main points, okay. Mr Strachan?

621. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes, I've got Mr Smart behind me to help with any details. I'll try to cover it and see if there is anything he will have to explain.

622. So far as Korda Lake is concerned, the proposals there to cross the lake, as I understand it, would involve cofferdams being erected around where the piers would go into the lake. Those would be drained off in order to put the piers into the area and, in the event of any fish being in those dams, as they are slowly drained off they are taken out and put into the lake itself. That minimises the effect on any fish in the lake. Of course, if there were any problem caused to fish, that result in potential compensation, but we anticipate that, with that sort of construction method, we minimise the effect on the fish.

623. Can I turn to the water ski club's P1507(0), which is on the screen now? What we have done in response to the concerns about the water ski club is to make AP amendments. We have created a temporary access to ensure there is always access to the water ski club during construction. We have also provided the existing entrance to remain across the route where there is what is described as a 'haul road' – and we have provided extra car-parking space as part of the scheme so they can continue to operate.

624. To give you an idea of scale for how this would take, the works in this part, behind the water ski club, will last about a year. The haul road itself providing access to other parts of the viaduct is just for viaduct construction, rather than mass-haul

movements. The viaduct construction goes on for about four years, but the actual works behind the water ski club is that one-year period.

625. Can I just show you P1507(1)? We have looked at the concept of relocation, and I'll just show you what that would involve. It being the end of the day, it's now taking longer than any other –

626. CHAIR: It's Burns Night.

627. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): P1507(1) – when it comes up on screen, you'll see that in order to relocate the clubhouse there are these three islands. These are within the SSSI and they are habitats for birds in the SSSI identified as one of the features of the SSSI. In order to relocate the clubhouse to deal with that one-year period of work, you'd have to fill in the islands to create one mass – of course then potentially displacing the bird habitat that is there.

628. MR HENDRICK: Is this a man-made SSSI?

629. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): It is a man-made SSSI. These islands were put in, I think, as part of the SSSI. But it's one that now provides for various over-wintering birds, amongst others.

630. You also have an issue that this then lies in the flood plain, both the access to the island that would be created and where the clubhouse would be.

631. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: You couldn't drive across the platforms to get there.

632. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): You could, I suppose. There is no doubt there are many other methods of having access to it, but I'm just going to show you the practical problems of addressing both those issues. We've taken advice from Natural England on the SSSI and the Environment Agency. I should also say that the SPZ – the Special Protection Zone for the extraction of water – is up in this corner. The corner of it comes into one part of the island.

633. MR HENDRICK: Before you go into detail about the proposed relocation, are you arguing the case that the clubhouse could quite feasibly stay where it is and not be adversely or greatly affected by the work that's going on?

634. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Absolutely, yes. The reason I show you the previous slide is that we'll maintain access to the clubhouse. There's a period of a year where the construction, which is one season for the club, is behind the clubhouse, where the viaduct is being constructed. However, that will be subject to all of the usual Code of Construction Practice measures to minimise effects.

635. The reason why we made those changes was to enable the clubhouse to continue to operate with the additional parking area as well – and we have pulled back the haul road.

636. Turning to the opposite, is there a viable proposal to relocate? We have explored that. I just need to show you – I'm not going to read them all out. P15078(1) is the Environment Agency's response to the idea of relocating the clubhouse in that location. They have identified the flood risk issue. I'm pleased to say they don't see a boathouse element as being inconsistent with the flood plain, which is reassuring, but the clubhouse itself, safe access and egress to it from across the islands, they do see as a problem. They identify a loss of flood-plain storage due to the land raise, so that would have to be subject to an issue. They have also identified groundwater issues, because it's within the inner zone of the source-protection zone. That's the sensitive area around the extraction borehole. Over the page, they've identified –

637. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Is the extraction boring down through the ground beneath the water?

638. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): As I understand it, yes. You take the extraction from within the chalk, where the water is pure. The water is filtered through the chalk, which gives it the quality. They identify that the work to create the land would require very thorough investigation, classified as land filling. They would have to be clean materials etc. Then there's the issue about connection of sewerage for the clubhouse in that location. None of those, necessarily, are show stoppers, but they're all significant issues they identify in relation to that.

639. In summary, the proposed location of the new clubhouse and boar stores is in a very sensitive location in terms of groundwater, backfilling the lake and the design of new structures.

640. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: It would need risk-assessment to see whether it's possible to cope with the problems.

641. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes. But, sorry, that's on the groundwater point. The flood risk they're less happy with, because you're putting a facility where people are in with the –

642. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Could you put it on a pontoon?

643. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I think the concern is getting people safely in and out of those flood zones. The general approach is to avoid them, if you've got alternatives.

644. Can I go to P1507(1), which is Natural England's concern about the SSSI? It's subject to the usual caveats about what they call lack of detail, but then it's really this third main paragraph where they deal with the effect on the disturbance of breeding and wintering birds. 'A cluster of islands was created when the original permission was granted. Due to the location of these islands, it offers a more sheltered environment, which appears to remain largely undisturbed by the activities. The relocation will result in the loss of an important bird habitat, but within the SSSI difficult to recreate and will also result in loss of lake surface area' On the sketch of the new islands on the western edge of the lake in order to replace the islands being lost, 'The new islands will not represent appropriate mitigation for the habitat which would be lost due to the dispersed' –

645. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: They need more information and things will need to be satisfied and so on and so on over the next page.

646. CHAIR: Can I ask you something, Mr Briggs? That's your optimum site, which is opposite, but there is a quite extensive landholding. Is there any other site?

647. MR BRIGGS: Yes, I think there are a number of points we would like to deal with there, Mr Chairman. First of all, can we just deal with the fish issue? If we go back to that, that's the first we've heard about some dams. We have no idea whether the anglers will be able to fish while works are going on. It's so vague. The value of these fish is high. These are not sticklebacks floating around in a stream; these are

significant fish of significant quality – and the angling club is a quality club. As with many things with HS2, things are very vague and the detail is still sadly lacking. We would be interested to see the further detail so we can make a subjective judgement on that.

648. If we then go back to the issues of the club itself and the relocation, the first thing we would say is that the islands referred to are all man-made. Mr Allen will correct me if I'm wrong, but when Mr Allen first applied for planning permission to put this initial clubhouse up, he met with significant objections from the Environment Agency regarding matters, all of which were overcome. There is nothing in the correspondence that Mr Strachan refers to that we consider can't be overcome. We have a letter from South Buckinghamshire District Council that I believe has been circulated to the Committee which actually says it supports the works that will be next to keep the ski club going.

649. If we go to 15079(2), Natural England actually refer, at the end of the first paragraph, to the fact that they have concerns about birds nesting on the western side of the lake and, therefore, it seems slightly odd to me that Mr Strachan would not be adversely affected by the skiing, when Natural England are worried about the nesting birds being affected by the skiing. It seems to me that it is one rule for the nesting birds and another for the members and the owners of the water ski club. Now, that cannot be right.

650. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Anyway, I think...

651. MR BRIGGS: It's just something that was used at me, Sir Peter. I thought I would give it back.

652. MR ALLEN: To be honest, we've given this a massive amount of thought. There is also a letter on record from British Water Ski & Wakeboard, which is our professional body, basically saying that this sport is quite site-specific. It's not as though we can actually go and relocate anyone else. Our lake is unique; it's sheltered from the wind etc. And that's the only reason why we want to move across the other side. It's the bit like the chaps earlier talking about the golf course. In all honesty, I play golf as well – but would you really go to a golf course where you've got a haul road running all the way around it. It'd be hideous to play. The same thing's going to

apply to us. You've got the haul road 10 metres away from the club house. That's not to mention the noise, vibration and dust.

653. Generally speaking, we're an outdoor sport. At the front of the clubhouse, as we saw from the picture, there's a decking area. In general, most people spend most of their time outside. I can't see why you would want to come along and join a water ski club to sit there on a pleasant Saturday or whatever with lorries thundering by. I don't know about vehicle numbers, but it's obviously going to be quite considerable. To say we'll only be disrupted for a year is not right, because the road is going to be there for four years at least whilst the other construction goes on. Presumably, if the road is there, we're still going to have vehicles running up and down all day long.

654. The third point here is the car park itself. Although HS2 have said, 'We're providing you with a car park,' they're not really. That's a recreational area which we then use an overflow car park on open-water swimming days.

655. MR BRIGGS: Shall we go back to that slide?

656. MR ALLEN: Yes, if we can.

657. MR BRIGGS: Can we go to 1507(0), please?

658. MR ALLEN: Okay, so, at the moment we have an area along there. To give you some idea of the size, it's 160 metres long and about 20-25 metres wide. That's our additional car parking. If everyone is parked correctly, you can get about 160-180 cars in there. We need that space if we are to continue the open-water swimming as well. Again, that's wrong – although it's a minor detail, because our storage is in the middle of that as well. This is the reason why we're faced with this choice. If we stay where we are, I can't see us having any members. I cannot see why people would want to come along, because water skiing is quite a sociable spot. We have people from all walks of life there – and, actually, some QCs, doctors and all the way down to plumbers, schoolteachers, nurses and so on. It's right across the board.

659. Everybody comes down because it's a very social thing to do. There is also a common interest, with the water-skiing, as well. This is where we step in, because we're the instructors and we're trying to make those experiences as enjoyable as

possible. I do not see how, if we stay where we are, we can possibly continue in that way – hence the reason for moving.

660. CHAIR: Right, okay. Any further points to add, Mr Strachan?

661. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): I've explained our position. I didn't show you P1507(7). That green dotted line is the A412, behind the water ski club. There was a point about this. During operation, we have very minimal impact on the noise levels of the club once the scheme is in place. It's that year of construction identified behind the club. After that, the noise levels are an increase of 2 dB in the day and 1 dB at night. The background noise comes from the A412.

662. MR HENDRICK: What about dust?

663. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Dust is subject to our standard Code of Construction Practice. We're not moving large amounts of material. We're creating the viaduct piers in this location, rather than digging up lots of earth. That's what's going on behind.

664. MR BRIGGS: But presumably the haul road will be carrying things like bars and concrete – especially if you're building viaducts down by Korda Lake. There's going to be a fair amount of vibration. You're saying, 'Actually, the amount of noise increase is going to be pretty minimal.' If you stand 10 metres away from a road, it's quite a lot – particularly if you take into account the vibration.

665. CHAIR: Okay.

666. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): This is the operational noise, when the railway's running. There will be noise from construction during the one year.

667. MR BRIGGS: I think, Mr Chairman, the point we're making is we don't agree with the HS2 data here, but the main point for us is that Mr Allen has achieved one planning consent when he first went there. He achieved it and he satisfied all the criteria. He's very confident that he could do the same thing again. He could deal with the SSSI issues; we could deal with the concerns raised by Natural England and the Environment Agency, as he has done before. What we would like is some support from this Committee to encourage HS2 to enable us to do that. I think Mr Allen is prepared

to do the necessary work to make sure that the water ski club continues. If we leave it as it is, we're very much afraid that it will have to cease.

668. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: I think we've got the point. And I don't sense this is something that has to be written into the Bill. I think it's something where we'll need to reflect to see what we think is appropriate to put in our report.

669. MR BRIGGS: Okay, thank you.

670. CHAIR: Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Mr Allen.

671. MR ALLEN: Thank you.

672. CHAIR: We did enjoy our visit, which seems like a long time ago now.

673. MR ALLEN: Yes, I know. It's quite unique. It was a long time ago.

674. CHAIR: Okay, thank you very much. Thank you very much to everybody today. Order, Order.