

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 Ms Ann-Marie Cousins.

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. Clause 6 and Schedule 6 of the Bill authorise the Secretary of State to acquire land compulsorily in connection with the works and the construction of Crossrail.
4. In the table in Schedule A of Notice No: 6124 sent in February 2005, my property (garden and premises at 71 Abbey Grove No: 217 and 219 on the Plan), is affected. It is intended that the Bill, if enacted, will authorise the compulsory acquisition of the property.
5. Your Petitioner is a single mother of two children aged 9 and 6. She has owned said property 71 Abbey Grove, Abbey Wood since 1989 and is an established member of the community. The property was specifically purchased, because of its size for the safe and secure raising of a family etc. which the Bill may directly and specially affect.
6. Your Petitioner and her rights, interests and property are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.
7. Your Petitioner objects to the compulsory acquisition of the property for the following reasons:

- (a) The Bill confers no particular benefit to your Petitioner or her children.
 - (b) Local Planning procedures were unaware of this Bill as your Petitioner applied for and was granted planning permission to erect a brick and concrete garage and outbuilding (currently being used as a playroom / office) on the affected land. Construction was started in April 2004. If your petitioner had been made aware of this Bill she would not have incurred the additional expenditure at this time.
 - (c) Your Petitioner currently experiences vibration to the property when some trains use the current rail track. This vibration causes the property to shake, items on shelves and occupants of beds to rattle / shake. Additional tracks and trains would increase the risk of noise pollution and damage to properties already borne by residents.
 - (d) More frequent high speed trains would be passing closer to the property there would therefore be less privacy and security for the children.
 - (e) Your Petitioner's children learned to ride their bikes in the garden because of length. The 6 year old learnt this summer 2005. If the Bill is enacted such future opportunities would be removed, forcing more and more unsupervised children onto the streets to learn to ride their bikes.
 - (f) Your Petitioner objects to the size and location of the proposed development and loss of visual amenity because they will cause a substantial deterioration of the existing and potential use and pleasure enjoyed and derived by virtue of the land being owned by your Petitioner.
 - (g) In 2003/04, your Petitioner had a grievance with Network Rail regarding the overgrowth of trees. She anticipates the problem will continue. If the Bill is enacted, it will bring the problem of danger from overgrown trees nearer/closer to the property.
 - (h) If enacted, the Bill will increase the problem of litter that blights the visual environment Network Rail's side of the track, much closer to residential properties.
 - (i) Properties with decent garden space are a rarity. This issue has not been addressed in Crossrail's Impact Assessments.
 - (j) Your Petitioner has not been sent any invitations to any Public Information sessions hosted by Crossrail. She therefore submits that the Bill should be set aside and await the outcome of proper and detailed considerations by the local planning authority.
8. For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully submits that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, clause 6 and schedule 6, so far affecting your Petitioner, should not be allowed to pass into law.
9. There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioners and their rights, interests

and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect 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 they may be heard by
their 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 her 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.