

5) Do you agree that the Government's proposed route including the approach proposed for mitigating its impacts, is the best option for a new high speed rail line between London and the West Midlands?

- NO. The chosen route is the wrong route and the approach for mitigating impacts is not the best option, because:
- The best option for Ruislip and Ickenham would be a tunnel (subject to assessments of vibration effects on nearby homes). This option was considered in November 2010, with officials stating it offered major mitigation opportunities. However this option was ruled out and did not appear in the current consultation documents. Therefore the best mitigation option has clearly been ignored.
- For the proposed surface route, the approach for mitigating impacts is flawed, as train noise at speeds of 250-300kmh have been downplayed whilst the mitigating effects of noise barriers have been exaggerated.
- Noise levels for West London are based on London to Birmingham train numbers and not the full Y Network (up to 576 trains per day)
- With evidence that HS2 Ltd have chosen to ignore significant mitigation opportunities; and have underestimated impacts, it is likely that compensation, environmental costs, or alternative mitigation costs, are also underestimated at this point.

6) Do you wish the comment on the Appraisal of Sustainability of the Government's proposed route between London and the West Midlands that has been published to inform this consultation?

- YES. The Appraisal of Sustainability is very poor and inadequate. In particular the claims for noise levels and mitigation. A full Environmental Impact Assessment should be undertaken and made available to the public before any further decisions are taken on this project.

7) Do you agree with the options set out to assist those whose properties lose a significant amount of value as a result of any new high speed line?

- NO. The options are very limited and do not go far enough. It is particularly worrying that the consultation states- "It would therefore be an option for Government to do nothing to supplement the existing statutory arrangements."
- The Exceptional Hardship Scheme and Bond-based schemes will enable the government to avoid purchasing properties, and there is no suggestion of any additional compensation for upheaval and disruption of lives. The Compensation-bond scheme would not come into effect until one year after the railway was operating (at least 15 years away), so is even worse and more unfair.
- None of the options give sufficient comfort and reassurance to affected families about when, and if, they would be treated fairly.
- Comfort and reassurance will only come if the government guarantees to buy homes along the route, at fair market value; with compensation for upheaval and moving costs; beginning immediately, if the Secretary of State confirms HS2 is to go ahead.
- There should also be reassurance now about compensation for those whose land is taken temporarily for building work.

STOP

HS2

— HILLINGDON —

www.hillingdon-against-hs2.com

**HAVE YOU SAID NO TO
HS2 YET?**

**£32 billion of taxpayers' money
£51 million per constituency
£1200 per household**

**DON'T LET THEM
WASTE YOUR MONEY!**

STOP

HS2

— HILLINGDON —

**DON'T LET THEM DEVASTATE
YOUR COMMUNITY!**

**TIME IS RUNNING OUT.
YOUR ONE AND ONLY CHANCE TO
HAVE YOUR SAY ENDS ON 29TH JULY**

What is the consultation?

The consultation on High Speed 2 is the formal process the Department for Transport is using to get the views of the British public on their plans.

It is made up of 7 questions.

What are we being consulted on?

- A high speed rail line to Birmingham, passing through West London, Ruislip, Ickenham, and Harefield, into Denham and onto the Chilterns.
- An option to link to Heathrow Airport, which could be from Ruislip through Hayes, Hillingdon, Yiewsley and/or West Drayton.
- Further options to connect to Manchester and Leeds, bringing even more rail traffic through Hillingdon.

Why should I respond?

- UK taxpayers will pay at least £32 billion - £1200 per household for a line that will probably be used by less than 1% of the UK population. (less than 10% of the population uses rail travel, and less than 10% of them take long-distance trips).
- They are considering asking London boroughs to contribute more – a double whammy for Hillingdon residents.
- £32 billion could be better spent on building and improving schools, hospitals, community facilities, or parts of the rail network everyone uses.
- A broad range of economists, industry experts, environmentalists and politicians think these proposals are wrong.

How to respond to the consultation

- You can fill out a questionnaire on paper or online – this needs to be received by HS2 Ltd by 29th July 2011.
- The paper version can be obtained by calling HS2 Ltd Enquiries on 0300 321 1010
- The online form and accompanying information can be found at: <http://highspeedrail.dft.gov.uk/>
- Alternatively, you can write your response

in a letter or essay format and send to the DfT. You must state clearly that it is your consultation response.

What should I put in my response?

You can write whatever you like, however you like. You don't have to write a lot.

We suggest you consider the points on the next page when answering the 7 consultation questions. However, please note that the DfT may consider a large number of identical answers as being one response – so we recommend you **answer the questions in your own words**. Further useful points for your response can be found at the following

websites:

Hillingdon Against HS2

hillingdon-against-hs2.com

HS2 Action Alliance

www.hs2actionalliance.org/index.php/consultation

Hillingdon Council

www.hillingdon.gov.uk/index.jsp?articleid=22901

Stop HS2

stophs2.org/hs2-consultation

1) Do you agree that there is a strong case for enhancing the capacity and performance of Britain's inter-city rail network to support economic growth over the coming decades?

- NO. The case is not as strong as the DfT claim.
- Future demand could also be affected by the limits the government wants to impose on international migration, which could reduce the number of working age people in England.
- Rail statistics show that approximately 90% of rail journeys are not long distance trips – therefore any investment should be for regional and local networks. People want local transport to local jobs.
- Investment should be spread out over all routes - for example by electrifying the

whole inter-city network - rather than spending such a large sum of taxpayers' money on one route.

- Experts disagree (most recently the Oxera report) that HS2 would bring the economic growth claimed by the government.

2) Do you agree that the national high speed rail network from London to Birmingham, Leeds and Manchester (The Y Network) would provide the best value for money solution (best balance of cost benefits) for enhancing rail capacity and performance?

- NO. The cost of the Y Network has not been correctly calculated. In particular the cost of building work, road closures, disruption to existing rail services, movement of utility supplies, the effects on local businesses and civic amenities, have not been included.
- Experts also argue that the benefits of the HS2 Y Network have been grossly overstated. This includes over-ambitious passenger forecasts, and benefits from assuming that travel time is wasted time. In fact, many business people work when travelling, with phones and laptops.
- Issues of overcrowding could be addressed by encouraging flexible working hours to discourage travel during peak hours.
- Other investment possibilities, such as Rail Package Two, appear to have been dismissed too quickly without fair comparison with the proposed Y Network.
- And even if it the case could be made and that this was the best route, industry experts agree that capacity problems might occur several years before the Y Network proposal is running.

3) Do you agree with the Government's proposals for a phased roll-out of a national high speed network and for links to Heathrow and the High Speed 1 line to the Channel Tunnel?

- NO. The route through West London is dictated by the presence of Heathrow,

but the Heathrow Express, Crossrail and (potentially) Airtrack already provide excellent services between Central London and Heathrow. So more links to Heathrow Airport cannot be justified, and there is no reason to choose a route heading 10 miles west before heading north.

- There may be some justification to connect to High Speed 1 and onto Europe. On that basis, there seems no logic in choosing a route that does not enter London from the north and connect directly into London St. Pancras.

4) Do you agree with the principles and specification used by HS2 Ltd to underpin its proposals for high speed rail lines and the route selection process HS2 Ltd undertook?

- NO. Consulting on one route is undemocratic and unfair, and improving rail infrastructure should be part of a national transport policy.
- The route has been chosen with no consideration of the full impact on local communities. Other routes and options (such as tunnels) have been considered and ruled out behind closed doors without public scrutiny.
- HS2 Ltd state they are in favour of creating sustainable communities – but in fact the chosen route will degenerate communities like Ruislip, Ickenham, Harefield and many other areas along the route.
- The principles include unrealistic passenger growth and unlikely shifts from car and air to train.
- A route that heads 10 miles west out of London before turning north is illogical when speed and straight line design are routinely claimed to be the basic principles of high-speed rail.
- The principle of using existing rail corridors and limiting property take has been taken too far, so HS2 runs alongside an existing corridor and is too close to homes and gardens, and schools.