

Organisation details

Organisation name

Inland Waterways Association

Details of individual in organisation

First name(s)

Philip G.

Last name

Sharpe

Address line 1

34 Old Eaton Road

Address line 2

Rugeley, Staffs.

Post Code

WS15 2EZ

Country

England

Email

philip.sharpe@waterways.org.uk

X Check this box to receive updates from the High Speed Rail (West Midlands to Crewe) Bill Committee?

Phone

01889 583330

Who should be contacted about this petition?

Individual above **X**

Another contact

If another contact, complete the 'main contact's details' section.

Main contact's details

First name(s)

Last name

Address line 1

Address line 2

Post Code

Country

Email

Check this box to receive updates from the High Speed Rail (West Midlands to Crewe) Bill Committee?

Phone

Terms and conditions

Personal information

A copy of this petition and information provided in the online form will be:

- kept in the Private Bill Office and as a record in the Parliamentary Archives.
- sent to the Department for Transport and High Speed Two (HS2) Limited after the petition has been received by the Private Bill Office.

We will publish your petition on UK Parliament's website. This will include your name and address.

The personal information you have provided may be kept in a database by both Private Bill Offices.

Communications

Private Bill Office staff may call or email any of the people named in the petition to verify the information provided.

Communications may be stored in databases to keep track of information you have given or received. This information may be shared between the Private Bill Offices.

Consent and confirmation

The information you have provided in the petition and online form is accurate.

If you have completed the form on behalf of an individual, a group of individuals, an organisation, or a group of organisations, you have been authorised to do so.

X Check this box if you agree to the terms and conditions

Hybrid Bill Petition

House of Commons

Session 2017-19

High Speed Rail (West Midlands – Crewe) Bill

Do not include any images or graphics in your petition. There will be an opportunity to present these later if you give evidence to the committee.

Your bill petition does not need to be signed.

Expand the size of the text boxes as you need.

1. Petitioner information

In the box below, give the name and address of each individual, business or organisation(s) submitting the petition.

The Inland Waterways Association
Island House, Moor Road, Chesham, HP5 1WA
Tel: 01494 783453
www.waterways.org.uk

In the box below, give a description of the petitioners. For example, “we are the owners/tenants of the addresses above”; “my company has offices at the address above”; “our organisation represents the interests of...”; “we are the parish council of...”.

The Inland Waterways Association (IWA) is a registered charity, founded in 1946, which advocates the conservation, use, maintenance, restoration and development of the inland waterways for public benefit.

Individual and corporate members of The Inland Waterways Association, and members of the public whose interests in waterways are promoted and protected by the Association, include boat owners, holiday boat hirers, boat building and hiring companies, marina and moorings operators and other waterway related businesses of all kinds, canal restoration groups, community boat charities, canoeists, anglers and users of canal towpaths for recreational walking, cycling, travel to work and for access to the natural and built heritage of the waterways.

2. Objections to the Bill

In the box below, write your objections to the Bill and why your property or other interests are [specially and directly affected](#). Please number each paragraph.

Only objections outlined in this petition can be presented when giving evidence to the committee. You will not be entitled to be heard on new matters.

Introduction

1. The Inland Waterways Association (IWA) has been engaged with all phases of the HS2 project since 2010 and has responded to each public consultation on matters affecting the waterways.
2. The *locus standi* of IWA in representing the interests of waterways users (alongside the Canal & River Trust (CRT) as the owners and operators of the relevant navigations) was recognised throughout Phase 1 of HS2. IWA's petition in 2014 against the unnecessary canal crossings at Woodend, Fradley led to the route of the Handsacre Link being altered as we had requested by Additional Provision 2 in 2015, the only major horizontal alignment change to Phase 1.
3. Other issues raised in IWA's 2014 petition, along with additional matters in IWA's 2015 AP2 petition, were heard by the Commons Select Committee in February 2016 and some of these issues were subsequently resolved. Two outstanding matters were then raised in IWA's 2016 petition to the Lords which was heard by their Select Committee later that year. The realignment of Wood End Lane is still not resolved but is subject to Assurances which may yet lead to a resolution. The other issue is noise mitigation, which applies equally to Phase 2A and Phase 2B.
4. HS2 crosses or closely approaches sections of the canal system at 14 Interfaces on Phase 1 (agreement between Secretary of State for Transport and CRT 4 July 2016) and Phase 2a adds two more. At Fradley Junction, Phase 2A commences just north of the Phase 1 'Manchester Spur' bridge over the Trent & Mersey Canal. At Great Haywood, the Phase 2A route crosses the Trent & Mersey Canal and runs alongside Great Haywood Marina on a viaduct. IWA commented in detail on the Phase 2A Environmental Statement in September 2017 on a number of issues around these locations, including noise mitigation.
5. This petition addresses the need for better noise mitigation measures at these two locations with respect to the local impacts and in the wider context of the underlying policy and principles of its provision

The Residential Use of Canal Boats

6. The canal system managed by CRT hosts about 30,000 licenced boats and most of these are used residentially, for varying periods of time. Some boats are people's permanent homes on recognised residential moorings in marinas or along the canalside. Other residential boaters are 'continuous cruisers' moving frequently around the system, although sometimes static over the winter months. Land based boat owners will use their craft residentially on holidays for several weeks of the year or longer, and often over weekends as the equivalent of country cottages, staying on their permanent moorings or anywhere on the network. Holidaymakers on hire boats or shared ownership craft may be on a circular journey over one or two weeks or more, or perhaps a more relaxed 'out and back' excursion for a long weekend. There are also a number of commercial boats, including traditional narrowboats carrying fuels or materials, and a range of trading boats travelling between boat rallies and festivals. There is thus a great variety in the way people use the canals for boating, but in almost every case they have facilities and accommodation for residential use.

7. When moving around CRT's canal system, boaters are generally entitled to moor in any one place for up to 14 days, except where shorter time limits are signed in popular locations. Boaters may choose to stop in an urban area for a while to access services or visit a local attraction, or to stop out in the countryside to enjoy its scenery and tranquillity.

The Impact of Additional Noise

8. A development that introduces extra noise disturbance to a waterway will discourage use of the affected section for mooring. If the additional noise is particularly intrusive in its intensity, persistence or frequency, it could effectively render a whole section of canal a 'no-go' area for moorings. At the same time, it would discourage its use by anglers who may otherwise spend several hours there, and it will have a negative impact on the many other users of the canal towpath.
9. Towpaths are used by CRT for maintenance access and by boaters to work the locks and movable bridges. Although some are public rights of way, most are permissive paths open for public use. In rural areas they are used for recreation by walkers and, where suitable, by cyclists. Anglers use them to access favourite fishing spots and for competitive match fishing. In urban areas canal towpaths are often intensively used for both recreation and transport, with many city towpaths having been improved in recent years for commuting cyclists.
10. Whilst towpath walkers and cyclists, and boat crews just passing through, may be transitory their low speed (3-4 mph), the length of canal potentially affected by HS2 noise (say 400m each side of a crossing) and the frequency of service (up to 18 trains per hour each way) means that they will be exposed to the passage of about 6 trains. Without noise mitigation the impact on such canal users will be significant, depriving the public of their current enjoyment of the area.

Noise Mitigation Criteria

11. HS2 however continues to regard all canal users as transient and not worthy of consideration for noise mitigation, except for a limited number of permanent residential moorings. They regard canal users as "transitory receptors" and no significant adverse noise effects have been identified in the Environmental Statement, either permanent or during construction. Despite previous representations by IWA challenging this inadequate characterisation, the Promoters seek to maintain the illusion that there are "no likely significant adverse noise effects".
12. Under current plans people resident on boats mooring in proximity to the high speed railway would be subject to excessive noise disturbance, unless by chance noise mitigation is being provided for nearby residential property. In practice this would create zones near the railway where mooring for other than very short periods would be intolerable due to noise nuisance, thus depriving users of their use and enjoyment of the waterway.
13. HS2 will provide noise mitigation measures, such as noise fencing and earth bunding only for what they consider to be permanently occupied residential sites. Thus a marina or a popular mooring area along the canal which is used by a succession of boats, each being used residentially for varying periods, is dismissed on the grounds that it is not the same people all the time. This

blinkered and inflexible definition of what constitutes a residential site is not reasonable and not acceptable.

14. Individual boats may come and go from moorings, but if a mooring area is occupied by a succession of people on boats there is then a frequent residential presence that should not be ignored. Noise mitigation to residential standards would not be refused for a hotel or hospital because the rooms were not permanently occupied by the same people. The fact that people reside there for various periods of time is sufficient to merit their protection from excess noise impacts and the same principle should apply to boats.
15. IWA contends that occupied boats, whether on recognised residential moorings, on permanent moorings, or on visitor or casual moorings should all be treated as residential receptors, and therefore similar to residential buildings for the purposes of noise mitigation. Unlike buildings, however, which can be retrofitted with double or triple glazing for noise reduction, boats because of their method of construction are dependent on external noise controls. In this respect they are more akin to caravans or mobile homes and require similar noise mitigation measures such as fencing and bunding at source.
16. Providing adequate noise protection for all areas where boats may at present moor up in the vicinity of HS2 interfaces would automatically also provide protection for towpath users and help maintain the public use and enjoyment of the major amenity and recreational facility that the waterways provide.

Noise Mitigation Measures

17. The exact form of noise mitigation required for each affected section of waterway, whether noise fencing across a bridge, with fencing and/or earth bunds on the approaches, needs to be tailored to each location, depending on the local topography etc. On Phase 1 CRT identified 14 affected canal locations and some of these have suitable mitigation planned due to the proximity of residential buildings. The additional cost of providing similar protection to the others would be small and can be accommodated within the existing land take and powers. On Phase 2A some noise fencing is proposed at and north of Fradley Junction and at Great Haywood, but it has not so far been designed to provide sufficient protection for canal users and needs to be extended and raised in height.
18. What is needed in these two areas is summarised in the next section but the exact details are best demonstrated with plans and images and will be more fully explained in evidence to the Select Committee if IWA is afforded the opportunity to do so.
19. However, the most important point is the principle that HS2 should recognise all canal boats as residential and all canals as residential locations, with the provision of appropriate noise mitigation at all canal interfaces in Phase 2A, and also in previous and future phases.

3. What do you want to be done in response?

In the box below, tell us what you think should be done in response to your objections. You

do not have to complete this box if you do not want to.

The committee cannot reject the Bill outright or propose amendments which conflict with the principle of the Bill. But it can require changes to the Government's plans in response to petitioners' concerns, which can take the form of amendments to the Bill or commitments by HS2 Ltd.

You can include this information in your response to section two 'Objections to the Bill' if you prefer. Please number each paragraph.

Noise Mitigation Policy

20. IWA considers that HS2 should review and change its whole approach to noise mitigation to recognise all waterway users as receptors requiring noise protection equivalent to permanent residential receptors. Wherever a navigable canal or waterway, or one currently undergoing restoration, is crossed by HS2 or affected by its close approach, noise mitigation measures should be provided to residential standard in recognition of the mooring rights on the canal of boats in residential use.

21. In particular, in Phase 2A the following design changes should be made:

Fradley Junction (In CA1 Fradley to Colton)

22. Noise barriers across the Phase 1 Manchester spur bridge over the Trent & Mersey Canal at Fradley should be raised and extended onto the adjacent embankments to provide more effective acoustic screening for the canal boat moorings, navigation and towpath users, as well as nearby residential properties and the Conservation Area.

23. The height of the route across the Trent and Bourne Brook valley, including the Kings Bromley viaduct, Bourne embankment and River Trent viaduct, should be reduced to the minimum necessary for the road and river crossings to limit noise propagation over a wide area which includes the canal, and to reduce visual impact and construction costs.

Great Haywood (In CA2 Colwich to Yarlet)

24. The noise fencing across Great Haywood viaduct should be further raised to the maximum possible to provide better noise protection for the residentially used moorings, manager's flat, and the other marina, canal and towpath users, and to limit damage to the marina and associated businesses.

25. The height of the viaduct alongside Great Haywood Marina should be reduced to the minimum necessary to bridge the existing railway line to help limit noise and visual impacts.

26. An adequate temporary noise fence barrier should be provided along the boundary of the Trent South Embankment Main Compound with the existing railway to reduce noise impacts on the canal and boat moorings around Hoo Mill.

Next steps

Once you have completed your petition template, save it and either email it to prbohoc@parliament.uk, post to Hybrid Bills Office, Houses of Parliament, London, SW1A 0AA, or call 020 7219 3250 to arrange a time to deliver it in person.