

**TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT 1992**

**TRANSPORT AND WORKS (INQUIRIES PROCEDURE) RULES 2004**

**THE NETWORK RAIL (OLD OAK COMMON GREAT WESTERN MAINLINE TRACK ACCESS) ORDER**

**REBUTTAL EVIDENCE OF JEMEMY DOUCH - HIGHWAYS**

**1 NOVEMBER 2023**

1. My name is Jeremy Douch BA Hons Dip TP MCILT. This rebuttal has been prepared on the same terms as my proof of October 2023 and it remains that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions.
2. This rebuttal proof has been prepared in response to the evidence of Mr Christopher Gent and Mr Mark Connell submitted on behalf of Bellaview Properties Limited and to address certain matters raised in that evidence.
3. This rebuttal is not intended to be an exhaustive response on all matters and deals only with certain points where it is considered appropriate or helpful to respond in writing at this stage. Where a specific point has not been dealt with, this does not mean that the point is accepted, and it may be addressed further at the Inquiry.

Christopher Gent's Proof of Evidence

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Bellaview's position</b>	<b>Network Rail's comments</b>
Section 3	Suggestion of alternative locations for temporary RRV access onto the GWML up to 2030 for construction / access compound; and provision of permanent RRV access to enable future maintenance.	There are a range of reasons why the Order Land (being plots 2,3 and 4, as shown on the Land Plan submitted with Network Rail's application for the Order) is the preferred site – this explanation is set out in Mr Ford's Proof of Evidence. Mr Ford's Rebuttal provides further context on why alternative locations put forward by Bellaview are not feasible, albeit further down this Rebuttal there is information responding from an access perspective.

		<p>The Horn Lane site is well connected by highway access and is situated in close proximity to the strategic A40 corridor. The premises allows for at-grade access to the rail network.</p>
<p>Paragraphs 3.29 – 3.32</p>	<p>Paragraphs 3.29 – 3.32 cover the potential access arrangements from Old Oak Common Lane, concluding that Mr Gent does not foresee any reason why:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The current road layout would prevent direct access from Old Oak Common Lane to RRAP in this location.</li> <li>2) Old Oak Common Lane would need to be closed (other than for temporary stopping of traffic movements under traffic marshal control – typically 1-2 minutes 16 times per fortnightly possession). The route from Mitre Way is also an option, as identified in the GRIP 4 report, although I will leave it to the evidence of Mr Nick Gallop to discuss any protocols for managing joint access with the depot operator.</li> <li>3) A set down area of 35m x 5m appears to be readily achievable adjacent to the RRAP.</li> </ol>	<p>The North Pole Depot has an access via Old Oak Common Lane to the west. This access is currently used for emergency purposes only. Old Oak Common Lane is approximately 6.5m wide and is managed and maintained by London Borough of Ealing as the Local Highway Authority. The site access junction is situated circa 850m north of the signalised junction with the A40 which is part of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN), a strategic trunk road managed and maintained by Transport for London (TfL). This route along Old Oak Common Lane to the A40 (south of the site access junction) passes through a predominantly residential area and has a bridge with a 4.8m height restriction. Approximately 60m north of the site access junction are low bridges with a 3.8m height restriction and a further 800m north, Old Oak Common Lane connects with the A4000 at a roundabout junction from which access can be gained to the A40 through a predominantly industrial area. Old Oak Common Lane also serves bus route 228 between Park Royal and Maida Vale. The 228 service runs every 20-30 minutes between 05:00 - 01:30hrs Monday through to Sunday.</p> <p>There is no approved HGV path under the bridges on Old Oak Common Lane in either direction. Any change to this restriction would require an amendment in the Construction Logistics Plan agreement. Furthermore, the low bridges to the north of the site access junction are being reconstructed in 2025-26, reducing the height available for vehicles passing under the bridges during this period.</p> <p>The Proof of Evidence provided by Mr C. Gent includes drawings 23-163-T017 and 23-163-T018 demonstrating vehicle tracking at the Old Oak Common Lane site access. The vehicle used is an FTA Design</p>

		<p>Articulated Vehicle (1998) with width 2.550m, length 16.480m and height 3.870m. This differs to the vehicle tracking undertaken by HS2 on behalf of Network Rail shown in drawings 1CP02-BVS-CL-DMR-SS07-000091. These show an Articulated Flat Bed 2.9 with width 2.900m, length 16.600m and height 2.731m and more closely resembles the type of vehicle anticipated to use the site. Network Rail's vehicle tracking demonstrates that the access road is not sufficient to allow the appropriate vehicle to manoeuvre along its route to the rail assets. In addition, the site access road has a downward gradient as it approaches Old Oak Common Lane and therefore affects speed and braking of approaching traffic as well as having restricted sight lines along Old Oak Common Lane. This access is therefore not considered appropriate for larger vehicles.</p> <p>It may be physically possible to on-/off-load the RRVs adjacent to the site access junction within the highway on Old Oak Common Lane. However, this is not considered to be appropriate, as advised by the BBVS logistics and traffic management teams. The on-/off-loading activity will take approximately 30minutes per vehicle and is likely to result in the temporary closure of Old Oak Common Lane while the RRVs are lifted from the low loader vehicle to the roadside (and vice versa). This will cause disruption to all road users including pedestrians, cyclists, vehicles and bus routes (the latter requiring buy-in from TfL). There are also safety implications as the RRV is not designed to travel long distances on roads. The distance between Old Oak Common Lane and the rail tracks is circa 200m. In addition, the height of a low loader carrying an RRV is approximately 4.4m high which would not fit under the bridges to the north of the site access junction (which has height restriction of 3.8m). The strategy would therefore require vehicles to arrive with RRVs from the southern approach of Old Oak Common Lane and depart via the northern approach, and vice versa when collecting the RRVs. This would result in additional HGVs travelling along the southern approach of Old Oak</p>
--	--	---

		Common Lane, which will need to be considered alongside other HS2 related movements in the context of the 24 HGV movements per day restriction in place along this section of road. Furthermore, the bridge to the north of the site access junction is being reconstructed in 2025-26 with the height limit being further reduced from the current restriction of 3.8m. In addition to increasing the number of HGV movements via the southern approach, there is no area for HGVs to turn around. These constraints all discount the potential for on-/off-loading of RRVs on Old Oak Common Lane.
Paragraph 3.36	<p>Paragraphs 3.34 – 3.36 cover additional access from the east from within the North Pole Depot, either to the west of Mitre Bridge or the west of the E&amp;C line bridge.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.36 concludes that the vehicular access routes to both sites appear to be straightforward and Mr Gent sees no obvious reason from a highways access perspective why they would have been dismissed by Network Rail.</p>	From the eastern access to North Pole Depot via Mitre Way, the vehicle will be required to turn around within the premises. Vehicle tracking demonstrates that the low loader can turn around within the site, however there is a point on the turn when the trailer wheels are being dragged sideways. This dragging is not ideal and would over time damage both the surface and the vehicle. In addition, there is plant and material currently occupying this space and alternative locations for this have not been identified. These factors combined discount this access location.
Paragraph 4.14	Suggests Operatives should travel by public transport.	<p>Operatives will be very limited in terms of using sustainable transport services to travel to site given the nature of the shift working overnight. Parking will be set out and managed as part of a planning condition.</p> <p>Many of the staff are transported to site by minibus thereby reducing the potential numbers of cars / single occupancy vehicles. This also minimises the amount of parking spaces required.</p>
Paragraph 4.26 (and echoed in 4.7 of Mark Connell's Proof)	Mention the lack of Transport Statement as part of Network Rail's submission.	A Transport Statement was submitted in October 2023. As set out in Section 4 of my Proof and summarised in Paragraph 9.1, transport impacts of the scheme will be negligible.

Paragraph 4.27	<p>Discussed the lack of Planning Condition regarding Construction Traffic Management.</p> <p>In paragraph 4.27 Mr Gent also suggests further conditions that 'ought to be imposed on the deemed planning permission relating to highway and transportation matters, such as might reasonably be expected on any construction project in the Borough'. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site waste management plan (demolition waste from the ramp excavation);</li> <li>• Ground contamination investigation and remediation strategy (ramp excavation related);</li> <li>• Construction management/construction logistics;</li> <li>• Worker Travel Plan; and</li> <li>• Site working strategy during night time hours.</li> </ul>	<p>My Proof (Paragraph 8.8) provides that a Traffic Management Plan (or Construction Logistics Plan) will be secured by a condition. My Proof also sets out proposed contents for a relevant condition and notes that the areas it will cover include a 'Workers Travel Plan' and a 'Site Working Strategy during night time hours'.</p>
----------------	---	--

Mark Connell's Proof of Evidence

Reference	Bellaview's position	Network Rail's comments
Section 4	Setting out policies in the London Plan requesting formal transport reports as part of the planning process.	A Transport Statement has been submitted and my Proof refers to Policy T3 of the London Plan which seeks to adequately safeguard and support the delivery of schemes such as HS2; and Policy T7 which states that we need to facilitate sustainable freight movement by rail.

		<p>The Project's compliance with planning policies is further considered in the Colin Field (Network Rail) Proof.</p> <p>As set out in Paragraph 8.9 of my Proof, the Order Land relates to the Construction of the Old Oak Common station and only constitutes as a temporary land use, therefore there is not considered to be a requirement to prepare a dedicated Travel Plan, Parking Management Plan and Delivery and Servicing Plan, which are typically associated with permanent schemes.</p>
--	--	--

Dated: 1 November 2023