

IN PARLIAMENT  
HOUSE OF COMMONS  
SESSION 2005-06

CROSSRAIL BILL

Against – on Merits – Praying to be heard by Counsel, &c.

To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in Parliament assembled.

THE HUMBLE PETITION of the Hanwell Village Green Conservation Area Residents' Association.

SHEWETH as follows:-

1. A Bill (hereinafter referred to as "the Bill") has been introduced and is now pending in your honourable House intituled "A Bill to make provision for a railway transport system running from Maidenhead, in the County of Berkshire, and Heathrow Airport, in the London Borough of Hillingdon, through central London to Shenfield, in the County of Essex, and Abbey Wood, in the London Borough of Greenwich; and for connected purposes".
2. The Bill is presented by Mr Secretary Darling, supported by The Prime Minister, Mr Chancellor of the Exchequer, Secretary Margaret Beckett, Mr Secretary Hain, Secretary Alan Johnson, Secretary Tessa Jowell, and Derek Twigg.
3. Your Petitioner objects to Clause 18 - Disapplication of controls. This relates to the disapplication of tree preservation orders and also relates to the preservation of trees in conservation areas.
4. Your Petitioner also objects to Clause 15 and Schedule 8 - Heritage: Disapplication and modification of controls. This relates to the disapplication of Section 7 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (c9) (restriction on works affecting listed buildings) in respect of platform lengthening at Hanwell railway station - Grade II.
5. Your Petitioner also objects to Clause 19 - Control of construction sites: appeals.
6. Your Petitioner also objects to Clause 20 - Proceedings in respect of statutory nuisance: defence.
7. Your Petitioner also objects to Clause 11 - Permitted development: time limit.

8. Your Petitioner is the Hanwell Village Green Conservation Area Residents' Association, established in 2002, to look after the interests of more than 350 households in the area. The Hanwell railway station, which has retained its rare Victorian character, lies on the southern border of the conservation area and adjoins the listed Wharncliffe viaduct.
9. Your Petitioner and its rights and interests are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.
10. Your Petitioner objects to the disapplication of controls as stated above, as well as to the changes proposed in control of construction sites and statutory nuisance proceedings. The effect of the relevant clauses is to remove the protection afforded to the environment, heritage and residents by the controls. Residents affected by changes in their environment as a result of works for Crossrail therefore have limited recourse, and the Crossrail Environmental Statement lacks the planning, detail and specifics to afford protection. The vagueness of the Crossrail Environmental Statement will allow the nominated undertaker to act in an expedient manner so as to minimise financial cost at the expense of costs to the environment and the quality of residents' surroundings.
11. Your Petitioner objects to the proposal to extend the platform at Hanwell station, on the ground that it is unnecessary. Hanwell is one of 13 stations where Crossrail proposes to extend platforms. The financial cost of lengthening so many platforms may well not be the best use of public taxpayers' money. Given the low number of peak-time 'long' trains designated to stop at Hanwell and the passenger numbers wishing to access/exit these trains, the existing platform is adequate for adopting the precedent of Selective Door Opening (SDO) used successfully at many stations. Automatic SDO equipment meets Rail Inspectorate safety requirements, would allow passengers access to and from designated carriages, and would have no environmental impact at Hanwell or at other stations proposed for platform lengthening.
12. Your Petitioner also objects to the proposal to lengthen the platform at Hanwell station as this is expected to involve loss of vegetation (significant tree screening and local habitat for wildlife). The vegetation at this site and on the railway embankment areas is recognised as an important green corridor. The proposed construction and storage sites fall within the Hanwell Village Green as well as the Churchfields conservation areas, part of which is covered by nature conservation management. The sites include individual TPO (tree preservation order) trees.

13. Your Petitioner also objects because the loss of vegetation will significantly increase noise from passing trains. The track at Hanwell is elevated some 6 metres above ground level, resulting in sounds carrying a significant distance, and thereby affecting many residents.
14. Your Petitioner also objects because construction noise, pollution and vibrations, coupled with vehicles carrying equipment and material to the sites (and resulting parking restrictions), will also impact on residents' homes and private lives, and contrary to Mr Secretary Darling's view that the provisions of the Crossrail Bill are compatible with the European Convention on Human Rights, your Petitioner believes that this contravenes Article 8. The restriction on the enjoyment of private lives (across most of the conservation area) resulting from the proposed extension of Hanwell station platform is not proportionate to the social need when there are other means of providing passenger access, e.g. SDO, or when there are ways of avoiding these impacts.
15. Your Petitioner also objects because no site plan showing method and detail of construction specific for Hanwell station is supplied. The extent of loss of vegetation is unknown, as is the area available for tree planting and reinstatement of vegetation. The area is north facing and to return this area to its existing maturity would take at least 50 years, as stated by Ealing Council in its response to the Crossrail Environmental Statement.
16. Your Petitioner submits that the proposed platform lengthening at Hanwell station is not necessary, and that the financial, environmental, and other costs far outweigh the benefits to users at Hanwell station. Your Petitioner submits that the Bill should await a study of the costs and benefits (financial and otherwise) of platform lengthening vs. automatic Selective Door Opening. Hanwell is one of many stations where this study would be relevant, and the cost implications for all the stations in total are significant. The flexibility provided by SDO to add other short-platform stations in future should also be factored into the study.
17. Your Petitioner further submits that if the proposal to lengthen the platform at Hanwell station remains within the Bill, the Bill should stipulate that where there is a range of feasible options, decisions should be made so as to cause the least damage to the environment, residents and the community, and not on the basis of cost alone. For example, the environmental study excluded extending the platform to the east on the basis of cost.
18. Your Petitioner further submits that if the proposal to lengthen the platform at Hanwell station remains within the Bill, the Bill should await a study by Crossrail to explore the feasibility of delivering materials and equipment by rail/hoist/conveyor belt to the works site, thus avoiding the environmental impact of vegetation and habitat

destruction by creating a new access route. This study should include the use of alternative storage sites, as suggested by Ealing Council, in order that little vegetation is lost in providing storage for materials and equipment.

19. Your Petitioner further submits that if the proposal to lengthen the platform at Hanwell station to the west remains within the Bill, the Bill should await a detailed construction and landscaping plan, which would remove the minimum of mature vegetation and achieve reinstatement of vegetation and habitat by planting with semi-mature tree stock. This plan should recognise the listed building status of Hanwell station, and seek to maintain its green surroundings. The Residents' Association as well as Ealing Council should be consulted at an early stage and throughout the process of plan development. The plan should also include proposals for monitoring noise and vibrations during the period of construction.
20. Your Petitioner further submits that in respect of works at Hanwell railway station the Bill will not meet the expectations expressed by the then Transport Minister, Tony McNulty MP, on 7 April 2005 when he moved a motion to carry over the Bill into the new Parliament. He said "Crossrail will enable better access to the capital for the hundreds of thousands of workers who commute into London every day". While it is now an accepted requirement for all new public services to provide for disabled access, Crossrail is not proposing to install lifts at the station.
21. Your Petitioner further submits that provision should be made for the Promoter to repay to your Petitioner all proper costs, charges and expenses (including the proper fees of such professional advisers as they may instruct) reasonably incurred in consequence of this Bill. A similar provision should be made for residents within the conservation area affected by this Bill.
22. Your Petitioner further submits that the 10-year extendable time limit in Clause 11 is too long and should become a fixed 2-year limit. The affected properties will be rendered blighted by this Bill, and prolonging this is unacceptable, especially as Crossrail proposals are vague in respect of Hanwell, making the impact uncertain.
23. Your Petitioner further submits that the Bill should include an undertaking that for the first 25 years of operation, Crossrail will provide at least the currently proposed level of service to Hanwell station.
24. For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully submits that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, clauses 11, 15, 18, 19 and 20 so far affecting your Petitioner, should not be allowed to pass into law.

25. There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill, which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioner and its rights and interests, and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioner.
26. Your Petitioner submits that, in the respects mentioned and in other respects, the Bill fails adequately to safeguard and protect the interests of your Petitioner.

YOUR PETITIONER therefore humbly prays your Honourable House that the Bill may not be allowed to pass into law as it now stands and that it may be heard by its Counsel, Agents and witnesses in support of the allegations of this Petition against so much of the Bill as affects the property, rights and interests of your Petitioner and in support of such other clauses and provisions as may be necessary or expedient for its protection, or that such other relief may be given to your Petitioner in the premises as your Honourable House shall deem meet.

AND your Petitioner will ever pray, &c.