

The HS2 Environmental Statement

A response to the HS2 Environmental Statement,
by _____

Disclaimer

I am/We are strongly opposed to the construction of HS2, principally because

- The original choice of route was ill-informed and misguided, the subsequent implementation has been very badly managed by the DfT and its creation (HS2 Ltd), and the claimed economic benefits have been shown to be greatly exaggerated by many financial commentators.
- The route through the AONB was originally chosen to maximise speed, while DfT now say the line is needed 'to increase capacity'. Less than half the line is in a tunnel, and the mitigation measures proposed for the remainder appear completely ineffectual. The degradation of the Missenden valley will have a long term impact on the attractiveness of the area as a destination for walkers and cyclists, which will lead to a decline in demand for local businesses .

We wish to place on record our objection to the HS2 scheme as a whole, on the grounds that

- No convincing business case has been made for it
- None of the various justifications for the scheme (speed, carbon emission reduction, capacity, rebalancing the economy, reducing London house prices ...) have survived independent scrutiny.
- It is of no conceivable benefit to residents of Buckinghamshire, whereas the 51m alternative¹ (to upgrade existing railways, so enhancing the overall connectivity) would be of some benefit.

As taxpayers, we consider ourselves to be directly and specifically affected by all aspects of the scheme, and so reserve the right to petition against any such aspects as may be discovered subsequent to the insultingly short period which has been granted for consultation on this document.

¹ <http://www.51m.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/ch1.pdf>

Table of Contents

Disclaimer	1
References	3
1. Traffic in the AONB	4
1.1. Chilterns Tunnels	4
Full tunnel	4
REPA tunnel.....	5
2. Traffic Assessment in the ES	5
3. Road Users	6
Bus Passengers	6
School Busses	6
3.1. Other road users.....	6
Cyclists	6
Equestrian	8
Walkers.....	9
Summary	9
4. The A413.....	9
4.1. Traffic Flows	10
4.2. Junction Capacity	10
4.3. Construction Compounds	10
5. AONB Lanes	11
5.1. Rocky Lane	11
ES Comments (Vol5 TA)	11
Displaced Traffic.....	12
5.2. Dunsmore Lane.....	12
5.3. Bowood Lane.....	12
5.4. Leather Lane (CFA9, 2.3.68-72).....	12
5.5. Potter Row / Kings Lane.....	13
6. B485 and Frith Hill	13
Frith Hill	13
The B485	14
6.1. Mantles wood portal	14
Deep Mill Bridge	15
6.2. Little Missenden	15

- 7. Tunnel Vent Shafts 15
 - 7.1. Little Missenden 15
 - 7.2. Amersham Vent Shaft..... 15
 - 7.3. Amersham Bypass..... 15
- 8. Conclusions..... 16
 - 8.1. Workforce transport 16
 - 8.2. Spoil by Rail 16

References

Paragraph references from this document are to Volume 2 of the ES, areas CFA 8,9 & 10, unless otherwise stated

1. Traffic in the AONB

1.1 This response to the HS2 Environmental Statement covers the issue of Traffic and Transport during the construction phase. We anticipate that this aspect of the scheme would have a seriously adverse affect on Chesham, for several reasons –

- Around one half of the surrounding countryside would be off-limits for recreational use, for both residents and visitors
- Transport links across the A413 would be effectively severed, separating Chesham businesses from potential customers to the west of the A413, and Chesham customers from High Wycombe
- Transport congestion on the A413 will cause major delays to commuters proceeding north towards Aylesbury or south via Amersham to the M25 or M40. More significantly, it will also affect the ambulance service serving our nearest A&E department in Stoke Mandeville
- Traffic avoiding the A413 is likely to take alternative, less suitable routes. Two of these (Rocky Lane – Chartridge Lane; B485 via South Heath) will (when not also obstructed by HS2 construction) lead to increased traffic congestion in Chesham.

1.2 Due to the extended duration of the construction phase (5 to 7 years), these effects cannot be dismissed as 'temporary'.

1.3 As the largest town in close proximity to the proposed line², Chesham will be affected by transport problems throughout the AONB, which form the subject of this report. We are also naturally concerned with obtaining adequate mitigation for all the other adverse effects anticipated throughout the AONB. These are covered elsewhere by collective submissions from groups in Community Forum Areas 8, 9 and 10. We fully endorse all the measures which they suggest.

1.1. Chilterns Tunnels

1.4 By selecting the chosen route option through the widest point of the Chilterns AONB, and without conducting a full environmental assessment, the government is in breach of its obligations under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, and under the Aarhus Convention³. These breaches would best be resolved by carrying out the required assessment and reconsidering the choice of route, since the scale of devastation to be inflicted on the AONB is now apparent, and the criteria (line speed) used is now no longer applicable.

Full tunnel

1.5 In the context of the current consultation, the only effective mitigation measure would be an extension of the (half) Chilterns Tunnel to a full tunnel, for the full width of the AONB and emerging beyond Wendover. The Chiltern Ridges Action Group have produced a viable scheme to construct such a tunnel.

² Chesham Old Town is 2.5 miles from the tunnel portal

³ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aarhus_Convention

1.6 Any additional costs, and increased construction times, are clearly the result of an initial choice of an inappropriate route. The HS2 project should suffer the consequences, not the Chilterns AONB.

1.7 *I/We fully support the proposal for a full Chilterns Tunnel.*

REPA tunnel

1.8 When the initial construction plans were published in November 2011, the scale of the works proposed between Mantles Wood and Frith Hill became apparent, and it appeared likely that the incremental cost of extending the bored tunnel to the other side of Frith Hill would be less than the cost of the South Heath cut and cover tunnel, with its associated works.

1.9 This proposition was developed by REPA, who have now costed the South Heath Tunnel and HS2 proposals.⁴ The latest analysis indicates a saving of £11 million, for engineering alone or £21 million if property compensation costs etc are included. HS2 on the other hand maintain that the extended bored tunnel will cost an additional £59 million (engineering). In either case, the savings from reductions to compensation payments, and reduced impact on the wider local economy *will far outweigh* any small increase in construction costs.

1.10 *I/We strongly endorses the REPA proposals,* should the full tunnel proposals fail to be adopted.

2. Traffic Assessment in the ES

2.1 The Traffic Assessment is deficient because

- It has been restricted to roads used for HS2 construction traffic, and ignores any consequential effects on other parts of the network.
- The description of the effects of congestion (moderate or major adverse) is inadequate.
- The predicted peak traffic figures are found to be inconsistent, where checks are possible.
- The choice of junctions chosen for detailed assessment appears arbitrary
- The results obtained from junction assessments have no relation to reality.

2.2 We can conclude that traffic congestion during the construction phase will be much worse than at present, but the traffic assessment is inadequate to make any predictions regarding how much worse it will be, or what might be done to mitigate the adverse effects.

2.3 As a consequence of these deficiencies, we regard the Transport assessment in the ES as unreliable and still incomplete – a fact which severely compromises

⁴ Residents Environmental Protection Association response to the Draft ES - <http://www.cheshamsociety.org.uk/HS2/REPA/REPA%2010%20July%202013.pdf>

the ES consultation as a whole, since traffic congestion is at the root of most problems during the construction phase. We take it to indicate that congestion will increase considerably, but that HS2 Ltd are unable or unwilling to provide any more specific information about the severity of the effect in different locations.

2.4 We request that a full, comprehensive and reliable Traffic Assessment be performed before the Hybrid Bill is debated.

3. Road Users

3.1 This inadequate Transport Assessment results in only derisory mitigation being recommended for the benefit of motorised users. Other users are almost completely ignored.

Bus Passengers

12.4.20 (CFA9) No significant impact on bus services during the construction of the Proposed Scheme has been identified in this area.

12.4.21 (CFAs 8,10) Apart from general congestions, there will be no effect on bus services, or disruption at stations or interchanges that will result from construction of the Proposed Scheme.

3.2 It is not clear what effects, "apart from general congestions", might have been anticipated, but are excluded by 12.4.21. Reducing road use by HS2 contractors and HGVs would appear to offer the only possibility of effective mitigation.

3.3 Routes 55, 177, 1, 73, 336, 353 and A30 appear particularly at risk; clearly the positioning of the Amersham Vent Shaft next to the Hospital has maximised the disruption to bus services.

School Busses

3.4 HS2 have identified many schools in the area, and many bus routes, but the combination of schools and busses has escaped their attentions. Our enquiries suggest that 15 school bus routes utilise or cross the A413 on their journeys, and are likely to be delayed by peak hour congestion. For children starting secondary school in 2017, the adverse effects will last for most of their school career, which must have a cumulative major adverse effect on academic achievement.

3.1. Other road users.

Cyclists

3.5 The Chilterns AONB is an important facility for cyclists – both on and off road. 44 cycle clubs are listed within 20 miles (a short cycle ride) from Chesham⁵. Three major cycle routes cross the proposed line, in four different locations. **Only one** crossing has been noted; no measures to reduce the risk to cyclists have been proposed.

⁵ <http://www.britishcycling.org.uk/clubfinder>

Chilterns Cycleway⁶

3.6 The Chilterns Cycleway is a 170 mile circular cycle route through the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, taking in the best of the Chilterns scenery. The route is mainly on-road and is signposted throughout. The cycleway crosses the A413 at two points –

Keepers Lane – Little Missenden Junction. Crosses a fast dual carriageway section, with a broad (car length) central reservation. Mitigation in the form of pedestrian controlled traffic lights, or a pedestrian & cycle bridge should be installed.

London Road-Small Dean Lane-Wendover Bypass Roundabout. The cycleway is listed in CFA10 2.1.12 (as a PRow) – but otherwise completely ignored. The route will be affected by construction of the Small Dean Viaduct, and the temporary closure of Small Dean Lane (with a diversion onto the A413, not a cycle friendly route). This requires a proper assessment.

Chiltern Heritage Trail⁷

3.7 The Chiltern Heritage Cycling Trail is the District Councils Millennium project. The 25 mile trail (divided into three loops) links the Districts two towns and fourteen parishes and visits many of the areas picturesque villages and places of historic interest.

3.8 The trail is mentioned in CFA8 (2.1.7). The route joins the A404 near Winchmore Hill, and then passes the Vent Shaft compound at the end of Whielden Street. This will require measures to separate cyclists and HGVs, which do not mix.

National Cycle Network Route 57⁸

3.9 Sustrans long distance cycle route along quiet lanes. In the Chilterns the route goes from Thame to Chesham and is signposted throughout. Part of the route is traffic-free and ideal for family cycling.

3.10 The route from Great Missenden passes under the A413 via the pedestrian underpass from The Square, and follows the footpath up Frith Hill to South Heath.

5.4.20 During construction of a section of the South Heath green tunnel it will be necessary to close Frith Hill to traffic for a period of up to two years ... During this time, traffic using this route will be diverted via Kings Lane and the B485 Chesham Road ... Frith Hill also forms part of **National Cycle Route 57**; cyclists using this route, therefore, will be subject to the same diversion. There will also be a need to accommodate pedestrian users of this road during the construction period. Frith Hill, which has a narrow footpath, links with a subway (underneath the A413)... During the closure of Frith Hill, there will be a temporary footpath diversion

⁶ <http://www.chilternsAONB.org/cycleway.html>

⁷ <http://www.chiltern.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=715&p=0>

⁸ <http://www.chilternsAONB.org/ccbmaps/161/137/national-cycle-network-route-57.html>

3.11 ... which sounds all very well, except for the projected 310 HGVs / day which will be using Frith Hill (South Leg) / B485 during the construction phase. Cycling slowly uphill in heavy traffic is a dangerous pastime. This diversion requires a risk assessment, and additional mitigation.

CoCP - Traffic management- generic measures

14.2.2 Generic measures will be discussed with the appropriate authorities and **may** include:

- procedures for driver training (e.g. to protect pedestrians and non-motorised traffic) and appropriate use of technology to remove blind spots;⁹
- retaining access for cyclists and pedestrians, **where safe and appropriate;**

3.12 For may read must ; strike out "where safe and appropriate" (who decides ?)

Equestrian

3.1.1 (CFA 8,9,10) ...Consideration is also given to diversification associated with the primary land uses, and to related land-based enterprises, notably equestrian activities.

3.13 This amounts to extensive references to Chalfont Valley Equestrian (in CFA8) – see the section on Bottom House Lane in the CFA 8 response. There are 7 other livery stables within a few miles of the A413 between Gerards Cross and Wendover, and in addition most farms have a paddock for horses. Horse riders make extensive use of roads and bridleways between South Heath and Kings Ash.

12.4.22 There will be minor adverse effects on non-motorised users due to increased travel distance from eight PRow and two road diversions for a period of up to two years at GMI/79/1 & 2, GMI/12/1 (footpath), Frith Hill, GMI/80/1 (footpath), GMI/23/6, GMI/28/1 & 2 (footpath), GMI/33/3 (footpath) and Hyde Lane.

12.5.8 There will be minor adverse effects on non-motorised users due to increased travel distance resulting from the permanent realignment of eight PRow and two roads at GMI/2/1 (footpath), GMI/13/3 (footpath), King's Lane, GMI/33/4 (footpath), GMI/33/2, GMI/33/3 (footpath), B485 Chesham Road, GMI/27/1 (footpath), GMI/23/7 (footpath), LMI/21/1 (footpath). The majority of realignments are less than 400m in length, apart from GMI/2/1 (footpath) at 550m, LMI/21/1 (footpath) and GMI/23/7 (footpath) at 700m and GMI/13/3 (footpath) at 750m.

3.14 CFA 9 made clear that diversions of footpaths or bridleways to run alongside the line would be unacceptable, due to excessive (train) noise. Whether bridges over the route are practical for horse riders remains to be seen.

⁹ See <http://www.britishcycling.org.uk/campaigning/roadsafety/article/cam20121012-road-safety-feature-Road-Safety---Heavy-Goods-Vehicles--HGV--0>

Walkers

3.15

There are 34 walking groups in Buckinghamshire¹⁰, including 4 ramblers association groups. Chesham is associated with "Walkers are Welcome" – "a nationwide initiative launched in 2007 to encourage towns and villages to be 'welcoming to walkers'."¹¹ This will

- contribute to local tourism plans and regeneration strategies
- promote the health benefits of walking and increase participation
- encourage the use of public transport

Chesham (Metropolitan Line), Amersham, Great Missenden and Wendover (Chiltern Line) provide access to the AONB via public transport, but face extensive disruption during HS2 construction.

3.16 Walkers will be affected by the same footpath diversions as horse riders, but without the added excitement of startled horses.

Summary

3.17 The ES shows little regard for the needs of non-motorised road users. There is one reference in the CoCP –

5.3.1 To reduce the likelihood of either an environmental incident or nuisance occurring the following measures will be used, where relevant:

- where reasonably practicable, maintenance of public rights of way (PRoW) (including diversions) for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians affected by the Proposed Scheme, including reasonable adjustments to maintain or achieve inclusive access;

which sums up the priority attached to any recreational use of the AONB by HS2 Ltd.

4. The A413

4.1 The impact of HS2 construction on the A413 is a major concern. The A413 northbound provides access to Aylesbury, Wendover and Stoke Mandeville (the nearest A&E department), and southbound to the Chalfonts, the M25 & the M40. It links the network of lanes, providing access to the AONB for visitors. During peak hours it also forms a barrier to traffic flows crossing the road, mainly due to commuter traffic between London & the Vale of Aylesbury. (Peak hours in this region are between 7am and 9am, 3:30pm to 6:30pm, not 8-9am, 5-6pm as suggested in the ES)

4.2 The road is mostly single carriageway, except for short sections of dual carriageway near Gerrards Cross, and north of Amersham (beside Shardeloes Lake). The section between Great Missenden and the Wendover bypass is

¹⁰ <http://www.walkinginbucks.co.uk/groups.php>

¹¹ <http://www.walkersarewelcome.org.uk/>

significantly narrower than the southern section. Additional construction traffic proposed for the A413 is likely to cause congestion throughout the Misbourne valley, and displace commuter traffic from the A413 to less suitable alternative roads. One alternative would be Rocky Lane – Chesham Lane which would provide a diversion via Chartridge & Chesham to Amersham. This would exacerbate the existing peak hour congestion in Chesham and on the A416 Chesham-Amersham road.

4.1. Traffic Flows

4.3 As presented in the ES, it is not clear what the likely impact of the predicted traffic flows will be, but by comparing the projected flows with the capacity defined in the (DfT) Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (a function of road width and traffic mix) we find the A413 to be operating at 95% of capacity or more between the southern end of the Wendover bypass and the dual carriageway section North West of Amersham (with the exception of the Great Missenden Bypass)

4.2. Junction Capacity

4.4 The queues predicted by some junction capacity assessments in the ES are far below those currently observed. We can only conclude that increased traffic on the A413 will lead to increased congestion, affecting traffic crossing or joining it.

4.3. Construction Compounds

4.5 The ES lists construction compounds in CFAs 8,9 & 10, with the number of HGV movements/day (in a single direction). The route descriptions in the ES do not divide the traffic between the available routes (A413 S, A413 N & A355), but a logical assignment would be

- Compounds North of Wendover Dean use the A413 – B4009 route
- Compounds between Bowood Lane & the Amersham Vent shaft use the A413-A355 route
- The Chalfonts Vent shafts use the A413-A40 route

I/We request that this scheme to be adopted, as it would reduce HGV traffic on the narrower section of the A413 between Great Missenden and the Wendover bypass

4.6 The proposed access arrangements for HS2 compounds in the AONB are, by and large, abysmal. HS2 Ltd have chosen to make use of whatever existing roads they imagine can be of use, without the slightest regard for their suitability. Issues of road width and junction safety have been ignored, and the disruption to local communities during the extended construction period appears to be of no consequence.

4.7 I/We request that all access to HS2 compounds should be routed directly from the A413, and should make no use of other existing roads.

5. AONB Lanes

5.1 The AONB is characterised by narrow, sunken lanes and footpaths running between ancient hedgerows, which are an essential part of its appeal to walkers and cyclists. Much irreparable damage will be inflicted by the construction of new overbridges, rendered far more obtrusive by the 2012 decision to reduce the cutting depth. The access arrangements proposed by HS2 Ltd generally result in more extensive and unnecessary destruction.

5.1. Rocky Lane

5.2 Rocky Lane is a single carriageway road, of adequate width at the junction with the A413, but above Hartley Farm (just East of the HS2 crossing point) it becomes significantly narrower, a sunken lane with sharp bends and a steep gradient. It is signed as Unsuitable for HGVs, and in places it is too narrow for a car and HGV to pass.

Vol2(10) 2.2.10 "an underbridge east of the A413, the finished road level of which is approximately 3m below existing ground level, providing a replacement of Rocky Lane"

5.3 The Chesham Society previously queried the necessity of this realignment.¹² It is unclear what the bridge height would be if the existing road was retained. Since the road above the bridge is unsuitable for HGVs, it may be that a lower road clearance would be acceptable. HS2 Ltd did not respond to this point.

2.3.38 "The Rocky Lane underbridge satellite compound/Wendover auto-transformer station satellite compound will:
.. be accessed via Rocky Lane, A413, B4009,..

5.4 It is unclear why this compound (a few hundred yards from the Small Dean main compound, and on the opposite side of Rocky Lane from the proposed new underbridge) is required. It is even less clear why the Small Dean compound, which is adjacent to the A413, should be accessed via Rocky Lane (2.3.39), which already has problems at peak hours. Small Dean should be accessed directly from the A413, and Rocky Lane (if required) via the haul road from Small Dean.

12.4.13 "These changes in traffic flows will lead to significant increases in delays to vehicle users and congestion at the following junctions: A413 London Road with Rocky Lane (also known as Chesham Lane) (major adverse effect);"

5.5 As discussed under 2.3.38, the proposed access via Rocky Lane is unnecessary and unacceptable.

ES Comments (Vol5 TA)

7.6.84 The assessment indicates that increased traffic during the most intensive periods of construction may potentially cause additional intermittent traffic congestion and delay at the junction of A413 London Road with

¹² Response to November 2012 forum - http://www.cheshamsociety.org.uk/HS2/AONB%20Roads_V1.pdf

Rocky Lane during construction of the Proposed Scheme. This may be mitigated through the measures detailed in the draft CoCP, as outlined previously.

5.6 Since the junction was *not* found to be operating below its theoretical capacity (7.6.83), why was it not assessed further, when Small Dean Lane (which carries around half the joining traffic and benefits from a roundabout at the junction with the A413) has been assessed?

Displaced Traffic

5.7 The 2021 projected morning peak traffic on the A413 (Southbound) is 1450/hr at the junction with Rocky Lane. 1% leaving the A413 due to congestion increases the southbound traffic on Rocky Lane by 12% of the projected value (118/hr). It is likely that the Rocky Lane traffic will increase to a point where the congestion level is equal to that on the A413.

5.8 An HGV ban between Hartley Farm and Kings Ash must be imposed, as it might help prevent gridlock, or at least increase the capacity slightly.

5.2. Dunsmore Lane

5.9 Dunsmore Lane is not listed as an access route to any compounds, so its appearance in tables 7-66, 7.67 (Vol 5 part 6; AM, PM peak traffic flows) is somewhat anomalous. The Lane forms part of a diversion while Small Dean Lane is closed, but it is unclear whether Small Dean compound traffic will also be diverted

5.10 The junction of Dunsmore Lane with the A413 is notorious for long delays during peak hours. Due to the difficulty in turning right out of Dunsmore Lane, southbound traffic frequently turn left, then double back at the roundabout at the southern end of the Wendover bypass. This demonstrates that a junction assessment is required.

5.3. Bowood Lane

5.11 Bowood Lane provides access to Wendover Dean, Upper Wendover Dean and (for the time being) Durham Farm. Above Wendover Dean farm, the road is not much used by motorised traffic, although it is frequented by walkers and cyclists. It might usefully be redesignated as a bridleway, and provided with an appropriately designed bridge

5.4. Leather Lane (CFA9, 2.3.68-72)

2.3.72 Leather Lane will be permanently realigned, 50m to the south of its current location, across the new Leather Lane overbridge.

5.12 This is discussed further in **2.6.41-44**; an option to reinstate Leather Lane to the north of its current alignment is rejected because

2.6.43 While Option B would avoid the impact on the trees to the south of the existing Leather Lane it would introduce new impacts to the north of the road. In particular, Option B would require an increased embankment height due to the difference in ground level at this point and this would increase visual impact. In addition, it would also result in the loss of a

small copse of trees to the north of the current alignment of Leather Lane.

5.13 However, 2.6.41-44 is identical to 2.6.34-37 of the **Draft** ES, which was issued without reference to the Waste Materials Dump ('sustainable placement area') now proposed for the fields immediately to the North of Leather Lane. The realignment should be reconsidered in the light of this development, since the belt of trees to the South of Leather Lane will act as a valuable screen to the Dump on the North side

5.14 I/We support option B for the Leather Lane bridge.

5.5. Potter Row / Kings Lane

(CFA10, 2.3.21-26)

2.3.21 The compound [Leather Lane] will:

- *be accessed via Leather Lane, Potter Row, Frith Hill, B485 Chesham Road*

5.15 Potter Row is quite unsuitable as an access road for 230 LGV & 30 HGV movements / day . Access to Bowood Lane is via the trace from Leather Lane, and there is an access road from Frith Hill to the trace at the South Heath Tunnel North Portal / ATS, so clearly it would be possible to access the Leather Lane compound via the trace as well.

5.16 I/We oppose the use of Potter Row and Kings Lane as access routes to the construction works.

6. B485 and Frith Hill

6.1 The B485 is a major route between Chesham and Prestwood - Great Missenden, and for Chesham traffic accessing the A413 northbound (towards Wendover, Aylesbury, Princess Risborough). The Chesham end is constricted by buildings in the Old Town, making the route unsuitable for HGVs; a campaign to introduce a HGV ban is ongoing.

6.2 The B485 also serves Hyde Heath (via Hyde Heath Road), and South Heath, Ballinger and The Lee (via Potter Row, Frith Hill and Kings Lane).

6.3 The construction of the proposed Cut and Cover tunnel at South Heath will cause extensive disruption to this road network for 4.5 years (2017 Q4 to 2022 Q1 – ref CFA9 Figure 5). The economics of the scheme are strongly disputed by REPA, who have costed an extension of the Chilterns Tunnel to Liberty Lane (beyond Frith Hill) – as previously discussed in section 1.1.

Frith Hill

2.3.59 South Heath green tunnel (north) satellite compound

This compound will be used for civil engineering works north of Frith Hill to Leather Lane. The construction compound will:

- be accessed via Frith Hill, B485 Chesham Road, A413 ...

6.4 Turning right onto the B485 from Frith Hill (Chalkdell Wood junction) involves a sharp right turn from a steep and narrow road. There are numerous gouges in the surface of Frith Hill caused by HGVs grounding while negotiating

the sharp change in gradient. The road up to South Heath is steep and narrow, with one further sharp bend, and passes several residential properties – quite unsuitable for the proposed use.

2.3.50 Realignment of two roads will be required:

- temporary closure of Frith Hill and 2.6km diversion of traffic via B485 Chesham Road and King's Lane, for a period of one year and six months to two years, with permanent reinstatement on the existing alignment.
- a) It is not stated whether access to the South Heath North Tunnel compounds will continue to use Frith Hill during the closure
- b) This closure will impose additional traffic on Kings Lane for an unacceptably long time; this would include HS2 construction traffic for compounds between South Heath and Bowood Lane (30 HGV/day), if the HS2 proposals were accepted

The B485

6.5 Provides access to South Heath tunnel (S), Chilterns main compound (Rail) – **2.3.46**, as well as the Mantles Wood portal (see next section).

2.3.50 Realignment of two roads will be required:

- permanent realignment of B485 Chesham Road, 120m to the north, across the green tunnel, including the associated realignment of King's Lane and provision of a roundabout junction with Chesham Road...

6.6 It is unclear how quickly traffic can be switched between the existing and realigned B485; at the point where they cross the cut and cover tunnel, the separation is approximately 60m, with the new road being built over the tunnel, and the old road not. A discussion of this point at CFA9 might have been illuminating, had the plans been made available.

6.7 We do not consider the engineering difficulties to be our problem, *but request a legally enforceable clause to prevent use of Kings Lane & Frith Hill as a diversion of the B485 during any part of any working day, or for more than one 24hr period during the course of construction works.*

6.1. Mantles wood portal

6.8 The alternatives for accessing the Mantles Wood portal (of the Chilterns Tunnel; **2.6.57-63**) are considered in some detail in Appendix 2 of the Chesham Society submission. The broader picture is that HS2 Ltd propose routing 100 LGVs and 35 HGVs along 4.3 miles of country lanes, and passing through two congested junctions, to access a site only 1000m from the A413. This is entirely typical of the lack of thought, and lack of concern for the AONB and its inhabitants which characterises this project. *I/We are in favour of option B, either in the original form or the variant which crosses the Chiltern Line by the Chalk Lane underbridge.* The location of access points to the A413 should be made having regard to the need to maintain access for Little Missenden residents, in the face of increased congestion. Option B reduces HGV traffic on Frith Hill by one third, and on the B485 by two thirds.

Deep Mill Bridge

6.9 The Chiltern railway crosses the A413 at an oblique angle at Deep Mill, necessitating a narrow 'dog leg' in the main carriageway, between the junctions with Hyde Lane and Deep Mill Lane. This is well known locally as a dangerous bend, with frequent accidents. Construction HGVs should not use this stretch of road during peak hours (as defined locally). Note that option B access to Mantles Wood would remove 35 HGVs from this stretch of road, and 90 if the South Heath(South) compound traffic was routed along the trace to the Mantles Wood portal.

6.2. Little Missenden

6.10 When the A413 is heavily congested (following an accident, for example), the old road through Little Missenden ("Highmore Cottages") is used by traffic avoiding the main road – even though this makes little sense, since the two roads rejoin again after a mile or so. With increased traffic on the A413, congestion is likely to be a frequent occurrence. I/We will support any mitigation measures proposed by the Little Missenden residents to prevent this.

7. Tunnel Vent Shafts

7.1. Little Missenden

7.1 Since this shaft is adjacent to the A413, it would have been comparatively easy for HS2 Ltd to produce an unobjectionable scheme. However, they have chosen to route the access road through the belt of trees separating the site from the A413. We request that the access road be moved further East to pass through a gap (nearer Mop End Lane), and that robust measures be taken to preserve all the existing trees beside the A413, which serve to screen the site.

7.2. Amersham Vent Shaft

7.2 The site can be accessed directly from 'major' roads, which is good, but is also surrounded by roads and constricted - a problem for the contractor ?

Map Book 8 – CT-05-028

7.3 The 'Roadhead' is on wrong side of A404 – construction traffic from the Vent Shaft compound to roadhead will have to cross A404

7.3. Amersham Bypass

7.4 The Amersham Bypass is the intersection point for traffic from Aylesbury to the M40 at Uxbridge (A413), M40 at High Wycombe to M25 at Chorleywood (A404), M40 Beaconsfield to Amersham (A355). This results in serious peak hour congestion. HS2 construction will add traffic from the Misbourne valley compounds, and the vent shafts (Little Missenden & Amersham) to the mix, leading to the highest predicted HGV flow on the A413, between the A404 & A355 junctions.

7.5 Despite the clear potential for extreme congestion, there are no junction assessments for this area (for what they are worth), and also a gap in the peak Hours traffic predictions between Gore Hill and Stanley Avenue. This presents an incomplete and incoherent picture of the (AM) peak traffic flow, and is inadequate to identify particular congestion black spots, while still suggesting

that HS2 construction will cause far worse congestion than is currently experienced. We request that an adequate assessment of traffic in the AONB be performed.

8. Conclusions

8.1 On the basis of this rushed and inadequate Transport Assessment, HS2 have concluded there is no problem :-

12.4.27 The implementation of the draft CoCP (See Volume 5: Appendix CT-003-000) in combination with the framework travel plan and the construction workforce travel plan will, to some degree, mitigate the transport related effects during construction of the Proposed Scheme. The reductions in effects arising from the travel plan measures have not been included in the assessment, which will mean that the adverse effects may be over-stated.

12.4.28 *No further traffic and transport mitigation measures during construction of the Proposed Scheme are considered necessary, based on the outcome of this assessment.*

(CFA 9; cf 12.4.25,26 CFA8; 12.4.27,29 CFA10)

14.1.2 (CoCP) Construction workforce travel plans will be prepared by the lead contractors with the aim of *encouraging* the use of sustainable modes of transport to reduce the impact of workforce travel on local residents and businesses. The plans will include:

- travel mitigation measures that will be introduced to reduce the impact of construction workforce on the transport network;
- target to reduce individual car journeys by the for (*sic*) construction workforce;
- methods for surveying workforce travel patterns

8.2 At least, nothing that a car share scheme cannot fix. This is outrageous. We request the following –

8.1. Workforce transport

8.3 In CoCP, 14.1.2 – substitute “with the purpose of enforcing” for “with the aim of encouraging”. Measures to achieve this to include –

- A park and ride scheme, routed along the trace, with suitable vehicles
- Limited and expensive parking (for contractors) at all compounds

8.2. Spoil by Rail

2.3.79 (CFA10) Sustainable placement of inert surplus excavated material will be used ... where it cannot be removed by either rail or along the construction corridor.

8.4 The movement of spoil has a significant influence on transport requirements – but despite this, the draft ES figures for HGV movement excluded spoil transport. The proposed solution – a waste dump at Hunts Green – was announced 15 minutes before the end of the last community forums (although the location was not revealed) and so no constructive discussion took place.

8.5 One alternative solution would be to remove spoil by running special trains overnight on the Chiltern Line. This could be done by building sidings where spoil could be transferred to goods wagons during the day. *This solution must be considered.*

8.6 If the present scheme proceeds, it is clear that no matter what mitigation is attempted, the Chilterns will suffer immense disruption for 7 to 10 years, and that this is of little or no concern to HS2 Ltd.

I/We therefore reiterate our demand for a full bored tunnel extending the full breadth of the Chilterns AONB