

construction, and will require improving substantially. At present, of the 26 households, only three qualify for any compensation whatsoever. Could I have the last slide, please?

82. Members, thank you very much for listening to me.

83. CHAIR: Mr Adams. Mr Strachan?

84. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Thank you. Can I put up P15486? Just while it's coming up on screen, the petitioner referred a moment ago, to a meeting that we had in November of last year, I'll show you the meeting note of that. Just to pick up on that, that reflects what we discussed in the Committee on the last occasion that London Road residents came before you, where we indicated we needed to have a discussion with them about the traffic running along London Road, and potential measures to deal with the construction traffic; that meeting's taken place and I'll show you the minutes of that in a moment.

85. But can I just go back one step and just identify the effect of AP4 on London Road, because these are issues which the Committee's previously looked at. This is London Road during construction. As previously discussed, the AP4 change occurs principally further up – or further down, I should say, down the route, towards South Heath, where the tunnel has been extended, as the Committee is well aware. One of the consequences of that was a change in the construction traffic routing and whereas previously, we were proposing to bring most of our traffic going north down Rocky Lane, which would then turn onto the A413, under the current arrangements, the link road from the south east site, allows about 50% of that traffic to join the A4...

86. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Five oh?

87. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Five oh, 50% to join the A413, in the vicinity of South Heath, Great Missenden, and 50% to come via Rocky Lane, along the trace and down Rocky Lane. So, the consequence of AP4 is not an increase in traffic for London Road, it is actually – one of the benefits of it is to split the traffic that was previously all coming down Rocky Lane, some of it will already be on – approximately 50% will already be on the A413, so there isn't a net increase in traffic; there isn't obviously a net reduction either, but it's not a change, of itself, which adversely affects the residents of London Road.

88. What it does mean, and we're well aware of this, and this reflects also the discussions we've had with Buckinghamshire, with the community, is that the issue of traffic through London Road and also accessing London Road from Rocky Lane – I'm just pointing to the junction here, as it comes and joins the A413, is one of the identified junctions which we have identified with Buckinghamshire as requiring work to be done to assess what measures can be brought into place to make that junction work.

89. And that discussion is going on with Buckinghamshire at the moment, based on – once we agree all the modelling, and there are, of course, a range of possibilities, including temporary signalisation, local junction amendments within the highway boundaries at that location. Our own restriction and management of traffic from the work sites, avoiding peak hours, as you previously heard, and moving more traffic along the trace, once the viaduct's been constructed, that's something which will reduce traffic later on into the construction phasing, and we have also, just to be clear, we are also considering the potential for bringing a construction route to join London Road in this location here, from the trace, rather than use the Rocky Lane junction, or use it to the same degree. So the traffic would come along the haul road and then join London Road, which would of course, benefit the local residents.

90. All of those things are part of an ongoing process of discussion with Buckinghamshire County Council. And if I could just show you where we've got to on that respect, there's a meeting later, 11 November 2015. The blue, I think, represents comments made by the local residents as to additions to add to the meeting note; I'm not going to take a lot of time going through the detail, but you'll see, as part of this, we've been looking at construction traffic, our position is set out on the first page. Buckinghamshire County Council's position begins at the bottom, they identified 57 junctions, this is one of those.

91. You have to go onto the next screen, number three, please. BCC's position is set out, and then general positions on traffic, and residents' concerns are set out, and you can see at the bottom, SW, which is a reference to the Buckinghamshire County Council officer, 'HS2 carry out traffic modelling which is then assessed by Buckinghamshire County Council experts. We've undertaken to carry out further modelling for BCC', and she – that's the Buckinghamshire County Council officer, confirmed that HS2 are still looking at the Rock Lane junction but that the Dunsmore Lane junction's been

assessed and HS2 traffic does not make a difference to that junction.

92. The concern was raised about being trapped. SW, who's the County Council officer identified, replied that if that happened, she felt it would be a one off incident, and was unlikely, given the nature of that road, that HS2 traffic would cause that to be a daily occurrence. And over the page at four, please. You can see the extent to which we discussed the traffic exhibits and histograms and the second bullet point. The identification of the volumes of traffic, and one of the outcomes of this was the residents' ask of HS2 to provide an assurance that the service road on London Road would not be used for parking by construction traffic, and in fact, by letter, we have actually – I see you're getting it up – we have actually confirmed by way of assurance...

93. MR ADAM: Last Friday.

94. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes. So that is a consequence of one of the outcomes of this meeting. On the modelling of construction traffic as I've indicated, that's the process that's ongoing, but can I just help with the figures, because if one goes back to the petitioner's slides, eight and nine, if you take slide nine, actually it's sufficient, A2062(9). The way in which these figures work, which should derive from the Environmental Statement is that we identify a 2012 baseline, northbound and southbound, we have a 2021 baseline, which predicts the amount of traffic that will be travelling along the road in any event, based on various forecasts and growth in the area.

95. We then identify in the next column, the addition of our traffic, so 1560, all vehicles, versus 1453, which is an increase of 107 all vehicles, that's in the fourth column, and it's that which represents the 7% increase through all vehicles on the road, but what we've also done is identify the numbers of HGVs by way of addition. Here, there were 38 HGVs with HS2 construction traffic, 30 of which are HS2 HGVs, and therefore, your 30 increase over an existing baseline in 2021 of eight HGVs, represents a 398% increase. So, it is actually only 30 HGVs added into the northbound flows during the hour.

96. And of course, those percentage increases become of less value in terms of a comparative approach if you're dealing with relatively small numbers of existing traffic, and you can see that from slide 10. These were the 4000 percentage increase and 14,000 percentage increase.

97. If you just take the northbound up here, there are 19 HGVs in 2021 with HS2 construction traffic, so that's 19 HGVs northbound on Rocky Lane. Of that, all of them are HS2 traffic, 19 HGVs, so in fact, it's 19 HGVs over an existing number of zero; bizarrely, it comes out as 4000%, so it could be an infinite one, but I think there's some rounding errors – not errors, roundings made, so if you take an average flow, which might be 0.1 HGV an hour, or whatever it is, because there's very little HGVs – there are very few HGVs on Rocky Lane, if you add in 19, which is what we're doing, you end up with a very large percentage increase, but in fact, all it means is that you have 19 HGVs in an hour going northbound, and 19 going southbound on that section of Rocky Lane.

98. And that traffic that's feeding into the road, we have assessed, for the purposes of the Environmental Statement during the a.m. peak, so this is what we're looking at, a.m. peaks, and p.m. peaks, that, of course, is very much a worst case scenario because of course, if there is a problem accommodating that number of vehicles during a.m. and p.m. peaks, one of the things that can be done is to manage traffic during those particular hours. Another may be the measures that we're discussing with Buckinghamshire, such as signalisation or prioritisation, or traffic junction improvements. So, I readily accept that percentage increases, when you're dealing with large – sorry, small numbers, percentage increases are of less value in showing you a picture, but it's standard...

99. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Essentially, it's of no value, I think.

100. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Well, no value. There's certainly no value for giving you an idea.

101. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: Normally there's no heavy goods vehicles, if you add 19, that's going to be a pretty high increase in percentages, but it's actually 19 vehicles.

102. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): It's 19 vehicles.

103. MR ADAM: It's not, sir, no, it's – it's 38.

104. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): 19 one way, 19 the other way.

105. MR ADAM: That's 38 vehicles going past our houses in the rush hour. They're

proposing to put in traffic lights which are going to slow the traffic down, so as I've said in my –

106. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: I think, Mr Adam, we heard you. What Mr Strachan's done is he's leapt into being more or less a Tim Harford acolyte.

107. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Well I'm just trying to – what I was trying to do is – for those who aren't familiar with how these figures work, is just explain why the percentage...

108. SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY: We'd be better off without the percentage figure.

109. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): In this case, yes. I think they've just been left in because they apply across the board. In some cases, some cases, percentage increases to traffic can be of value in showing what the overall flow effects are. They're not of particular – well, I think they're of no value in this particular context, but there they are. For those who like percentages, they're there.

110. The more important thing is the Buckinghamshire County Council work that's ongoing, our work, which is ongoing to look at managing the traffic along Rocky Lane and the effects on London Road. I think there may be a misapprehension; our understanding is that Buckinghamshire County Council have indicated that any measures made to improve the junction should be temporary, and that they would potentially like to see them taken out afterwards, so if there was signalisation, they would envisage temporary rather than permanent feature. I don't understand them to be referring to other improvements such as pedestrian footways, but that's our understanding of how things stand.

111. On the issue of the footpath which has been raised; that was one of the things discussed on 11 November. It is not, so far as I'm aware, a funding or a costs issue, because it's a 400m footway along that part of the road, if it were to be constructed, which is a relatively modest sum in terms of costs. The issue is in relation to the potential safety of it, it would be a one metre footway along the A413, but perhaps more pertinently, the implications of constructing it, which will require closure of one traffic lane of the A413. We're happy to take forward those discussions with Buckinghamshire County Council, but that's my understanding of the current issues that arise from that.

But that sort of issue is the sort of thing that we can usefully to continue to have discussions with Buckinghamshire County Council so we're introducing a measure like that is more counterproductive than productive. But, as I said, the November meeting indicates that that's clearly one of the items that remains on the agenda for future discussion.

112. I don't have any specific details about Mr and Mrs Lue's situation, because it's not raised in these slides, but I know the Committee's already made comments about the need to sell scheme. I understand, or I understood Mr and Mrs Lue had been on accepted onto it. As to issues of valuation, you've heard about those already from us. I don't have any further details on that particular place.

113. On the general point about need to sell scheme, the need to sell scheme of course is applicable here for those who consider the position is not one they want to live with and that there are various criteria on the need to sell scheme. What I would emphasise is that these measures that we're taking forward with Buckinghamshire County Council are all intended to ensure that the overall construction effect is minimised by regulating traffic in the way I've indicated.

114. The other aspects of the scheme, for example the noise environment, all of those remain unchanged from those which you looked at on the last occasion when the London Road residents came in and I wasn't proposing to go through them again.

115. MR ADAM: Chair, can I possibly come to you on just one point? And that is, if we could have slide P15486 back up again. Thank you. That is dated 18 January 2016, so it's a pretty new proposal so far as HS2 is concerned, and it shows in yellow, running along from the A413 link road here, a haul road. But so far as I can ascertain from the HS2's documents that go with this, this is going to be a one way street, and although 100% of all the spoil is going to be brought out along that haul road to the junction with the A413 or the site here, it's not moving. To the site there, all the traffic going back is going to go back past our houses, so although 50% may be, say one way, we're going to get 100% the other way. And that traffic is then going to go – at least a lot of it is then going to turn left up Rocky Lane.

116. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Well, can I just help? That is not the case. What I was identifying is that one of the things that's under discussion is whether it would be

possible to have a junction in that location.

117. MR ADAM: No, that's a different matter.

118. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Rather than at Rocky Lane, and if it were, that's where the junction would be, but that's just one of the things that's under discussion and it requires a view from Buckinghamshire County Council as well as the residents, but I'm just indicating that all options are on the table.

119. MR ADAM: I think my friend is actually blurring what I'm saying. What I'm saying is that all that traffic is going to be coming from right to left along that trace – the haul road. It doesn't matter where the junction is; all the traffic coming back, all the empty HGVs are going to be coming back past our houses, and either up Rocky Lane or continuing along past the A413. Anything going up Rocky Lane meeting an HGV, whether it's an HS2 HGV or somebody else's, it's not going to be able to pass it, so we're going to have to have traffic lights there which are going to cause us consternation with standing traffic, traffic fumes etc. I needn't go on any further, sir.

120. CHAIR: Okay. Anything further to add?

121. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes, it's a two-way haul road.

122. CHAIR: Two-way haul road, okay. Thank you. Any final comment, Mr Adam? Mr Adam, any brief final comment?

123. MR ADAM: No, no.

124. CHAIR: Okay. Thank you.

125. MR ADAM: Yes, there is a further comment. We have got another map from HS2 which I haven't – yes, P8143, which shows two-way traffic up Rocky Lane. Perhaps that's out of date as it's dated 17 August.

126. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): That's right, that's two-way traffic up Rocky Lane.

127. MR ADAM: Two-way traffic up Rocky Lane?

128. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): Yes.

129. MR ADAM: Two-way traffic up Rocky Lane is impossible, sir.

130. CHAIR: Is it impossible, Mr Strachan?

131. MR STRACHAN QC (DfT): No. Obviously, we recognise Rocky Lane is a relatively narrow road, it's not ideal, it's not impossible, but of course, it's all feeding into the discussions that we're having about managing traffic down Rocky Lane, and indeed the potential to connect further along onto the A413. I can't speak for Buckinghamshire as to how those things will progress, but they are all under active consideration.

132. CHAIR: Okay. Well, no doubt your county council will...

133. MR ADAM: Well, it's as far as we can go, isn't it, sir?

134. CHAIR: It is. Thank you very much, thank you very much both of you for coming today. We now move onto 1591 HS2 Action Alliance Limited.

HS2 Action Alliance Limited

135. MR MCCracken QC: Good afternoon, sir. I'm Robert McCracken, Queen's Counsel, and I'm instructed by Nabarro. You have, I hope, not only slides, but also a bundle of printed material which sets out both the printout of the slides and some summary documents from our expert, who are, all of them, technical experts in the field on which they are going to give evidence.

136. The matters that the Committee has been considering over the last, I think, 18 months, are substantial and it's become apparent, I think, and I'm sure it is apparent to the Committee that many of the points that petitioners are making, are broadly similar points, and indeed, some of the points that our experts make will be putting in technical language, points that have been made by other lay people.

137. Inevitably, in view of the shortage of time that the Committee has, much will have to be left to the written material that we presented, and today, I intend to focus orally on four principle points, although briefly, I'll be presenting all our witnesses to you. But the four principle points that I'm going to focus on orally, are first of all, the need for an independent adjudicator to deal with the many matters that are not yet determined, and