

10 August, 2017

Dear Sirs,

East West Rail Western section phase 2

We write to lodge our objection to the haul route to a strategic depot at Claydon Junction, as proposed in the East West Rail Western section phase 2 (EWR2) round two public consultation.

Whilst accepting the undoubted benefits of the East West rail connection itself, we find the basis, credibility and rationale behind the proposed haul route incomprehensible.

The haul route from the A41, as proposed, passes through the Parishes of Grendon Underwood, Edgcott, Calvert, Twyford & Charndon. We join all of these in objecting to the haul route on the following grounds.

- The planning consultation process to date is a travesty of the planning process in respect of both 'consultation' and 'planning'. The original consultation document has, unilaterally and without consultation, been changed to (a) show an increase in heavy goods traffic of some 7 times over those originally proposed and with no meaningful forecasts of increased traffic volumes of light goods vehicles and cars in support of some 300 workers and (b) originally proposed haul roads avoiding any impact on local infrastructure have been withdrawn on the grounds of cost.
- Based on such unreliable data to date, the consultation programme should be restarted or at least rescheduled.
- We find it incomprehensible that there does not seem to be any rational consideration of the cumulative effect of this project on top of similar numbers of HGVs and other traffic for another 300 staff arising from an HS2 Infrastructure Maintenance Depot at Calvert, some 800 meters from the EWR depot, and using the exact same haul route.
- We cannot understand how AVDC is still considering development applications potentially adding traffic from some 200+ houses directly onto this route without any consideration of either rail project.
- There is now no way of knowing whether EWR forecasts are (a) a credible basis on which to make planning decisions or (b) that there is a credible means of ensuring they will be adhered to once they have gained approvals based on discredited & variable data.

- We do not understand how approvals can be sought or given for two projects deliberately seeking to duplicate resource, cost, safety risk and collateral damage for two similar projects in such close proximity to each other.
- We are dismayed that a road haul solution with high impact and risk to the health & safety of local communities is seen as a more acceptable alternative than others with little or no impact on local communities and which have already been planned for.
- We do not agree a separate depot is necessary at all - there are two other EWR depots in close proximity as well as an HS2 depot some 800 meters away. The Act of Parliament enabling this project specifically stated that every effort should be made to consolidate resources, overheads and disruption with HS2 wherever possible.
- We question why alternative locations of the depot have been rejected, if considered at all. Several alternatives have been identified with much reduced impact on local infrastructure.
- We question the rationale for the withdrawal of originally proposed haul routes in favour of a totally unsuitable and unsafe alternative. To make any credible response to the consultation, we need to know: a) the cost saving of abolishing the original haul roads. This is not available. (b) the on-cost of the inevitable infrastructure works necessary to accommodate such traffic volumes through the villages affected. This is not available.

We look forward to your response. Thank you.

Yours faithfully,

Kim Moloney

Kim Moloney
Chair
Grendon Underwood Parish Council