

IN PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SESSION 2005–06

CROSSRAIL BILL

P E T I T I O N

Against the Bill – 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:

GREAT PORTLAND ESTATES PLC,

COLLIN ESTATES LIMITED,

G.P.E. (61 ST MARY AXE) LIMITED

G.P.E. (80 BISHOPSGATE) LIMITED,

G.P.E. (88/104 BISHOPSGATE) LIMITED,

HARTSTAND LIMITED,

ILEX LIMITED,

J.L.P INVESTMENT COMPANY LIMITED,

PONTSARN INVESTMENTS LIMITED,

THE GREAT VICTORIA PARTNERSHIP (G.P) (No.2) LIMITED AND

THE GREAT VICTORIA PARTNERSHIP (G.P) LIMITED

SHEWETH as follows:—

- 1 A Bill (hereinafter referred to as “the Bill”) has been introduced into 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 promoted by the Secretary of State for Transport (hereinafter called “the Promoter”).

*Relevant clauses of the Bill*

- 3 Clauses 1 to 20 of the Bill together with Schedules 1 to 9 make provision for the construction and maintenance of the proposed works including the main works set out in Schedule 1. Provision is included to confer powers for various building and engineering operations, for compulsory acquisition and the temporary use of and entry upon land, for the grant of planning permission and other consents, for the disapplication or modification of heritage and other controls and to govern interference with trees and the regulation of noise.

- 4 Clauses 21 to 44 of the Bill together with Schedule 10 make provision for the application with modifications and the disapplication in part of the existing railways regulatory regime which is contained in and in arrangements made under the Railways Act 1993 and associated legislation. In particular, they provide for the disapplication of licensing requirements, the imposition of special duties on the Office of Rail Regulation (“ORR”), the modification of railway access contract and franchising arrangements and the disapplication of railway closure requirements and of the need for consent from Transport for London in relation to impacts on key system assets. Provision is also included to enable agreements to be required as between the nominated undertaker and controllers of railway assets, to govern the basis for arbitration and to provide for the transfer of statutory powers in relation to railway assets.

- 5 Clauses 45 to 59 of the Bill together with Schedules 11 to 14 contain miscellaneous and general provisions. These include provision for the making of transfer schemes, the designation of nominated undertakers, the devolution of functions and as respects other actions to be taken by the Secretary of State. Provision is also made in

particular for the disapplication or modification of various additional miscellaneous controls, for the treatment of burial grounds, for the application of provisions of the Bill to future extensions of Crossrail, for the particular protection of certain specified interests and as respects arbitration.

*Your Petitioners and their properties*

6 Your Petitioners are major property owners in the United Kingdom and between them own the following freehold and leasehold properties (collectively “your Petitioners’ properties”) in the vicinity of the proposed railway:—

- (a) Those properties specified as subject to subsoil acquisition under Schedule 6, Part 3, paragraph 11(1) of the Bill:
  - (i) in the City of Westminster, 64 New Bond Street (numbered 432 on the deposited plans), 14-18 Brook Street (numbered 433 on the deposited plans) (together called “the Brook Street properties”) and 79-89 Oxford Street (part of which has been marked as plot 601 on the deposited plans) (“the Oxford Street property”) (hereinafter together called the “Brook Street and Oxford Street Properties”).
- (b) Those properties which lie adjacent to but outside the limits of deviation specified on the deposited plans to the Bill:
  - (i) in the City of Westminster, 293-295 Oxford Street (14 Hanover Square) (hereinafter called “the Hanover Square Property”).
- (c) Those properties that are located in various local areas along the route of the proposed railway which are not specified in the Bill or associated documentation as directly affected by the proposed scheme, but are likely to be exposed to ancillary impacts of the proposed scheme:
  - (i) in the City of Westminster, 508-540 Oxford Street, 15-16 New Bond Street, 208-222 Regent Street, 32 Kingley Street, 26-28 and 30-34 Broadwick Street, 81-82 Dean Street and in the London Borough of Camden, 70 Grays’ Inn Road and in the City of London, 12 Dyers’ Buildings, 24-31 Holborn, 80 and 88-102 Bishopsgate, 61 St. Mary

Axe and 1-11 and 12-20 Camomile Street (hereinafter called "the other affected Properties").

- 7 The Brook Street and Oxford Street Properties, the Hanover Square Property, as well as several of your Petitioners' other affected Properties are subject to extensive retail and commercial activity of significant value, serving (amongst others) various well-known retail brand names and products.

*Your Petitioners' concerns*

- 8 Your Petitioners support the concept and desirability of an East-West rail link between Maidenhead and Shenfield, and the improvement of public transport provision in London and the surrounding areas, and are therefore supportive of the Bill in principle. Furthermore, your Petitioners seek to work together with Cross London Rail Links Limited, the Government and the local authorities (in particular the City of Westminster) to facilitate the provision of Crossrail.
- 9 Your Petitioners do not object to the principle of the proposed railway, but they are concerned the provisions of the Bill may affect your Petitioners' properties. For this reason, and having regard to the more detailed particulars referred to below, your Petitioners object to the Bill and its provisions referred to above and they allege and are prepared to prove that they and their property, rights and interests are injuriously and prejudicially affected by the Bill for the reasons (amongst others) hereinafter appearing.

*Compulsory purchase and subsoil acquisition of the Brook Street and Oxford Street Properties and related matters*

- 10 Your Petitioners object to the provisions of Clause 6 of the Bill, which they apprehend could adversely affect and interfere with the Brook Street and Oxford Street Properties which are subject to powers of compulsory purchase. The Brook Street properties are located immediately above the centre line of Work No. 1/3B, being the southern bore of the twin-bore tunnels running between the proposed Bond

Street Station and the proposed Bond Street Station Eastern Ticket Hall at Hanover Square. The Oxford Street property is located close to Work No. 1/3A and straddles the limit of deviation of that work. Under the provisions of Clause 6 and Clause 7, the Promoter will be able to acquire rights in the sub-soil and under surface of the Brook Street and Oxford Street Properties which fall within the limits of deviation on the deposited plans and sections. Your Petitioners are concerned that the exercise of these powers could lead to damage to these properties and a serious detraction from your Petitioners' quiet enjoyment of them.

- 11 The exercise by the Promoter of its powers for the compulsory acquisition of land or of interests in land could also result in the development potential of the Brook Street and Oxford Street Properties being severely constrained, since the load-bearing capacity of the soil underneath them could be significantly reduced by the proposed works with the result that the type and size of building which the ground would be able to support could be different to that which exists today.
- 12 Your Petitioners are especially concerned that the proposed limits of lateral and vertical deviation in Clause 1 of the Bill would permit the route for Works Nos. 1/3A and 1/3B to be varied so as to bring the Works closer to (either vertically or horizontally) the Brook Street and Oxford Street Properties. The provisions of Clause 1 of the Bill could therefore well result, your Petitioners apprehend, in an inadequate vertical and horizontal distance between the soffit of the tunnels forming part of Works Nos. 1/3A and 1/3B and the bottommost part of the basements of the Brook Street and Oxford Street Properties. The resulting noise, vibration and, possibly, damage would therefore cause your Petitioners great inconvenience and loss. Your Petitioners therefore submit that such deviation could and should be more closely restricted wherever possible.
- 13 Accordingly, your Petitioners humbly submit that the Promoter should demonstrate and be put to strict proof of the need for and desirability of the proposals in the Bill, as affecting the Brook Street and Oxford Street Properties. Furthermore, they should be put to proof as to whether the limits of deviation of Works Nos. 1/3A and 1/3B, the resulting powers for the compulsory acquisition of land or of interests in land, the power to construct works and the exercise of works and ancillary powers within the

limits of deviation should be restricted to the extent (if any) to which the Promoter is justified so as to minimise or prevent interference with those properties. In particular, your Petitioners contend that any interest in its properties (including interests in the sub-soil of the properties) acquired by the Promoter (in terms of the area over which it is to subsist, the form in which it is to take at law and any express or implied constraints which may be imposed upon the remainder of your Petitioners' properties) should be strictly limited only to that which is absolutely necessary for the construction, safe operation and maintenance of the proposed works.

*Impact on the Hanover Square Property*

- 14 Although just outside the limits of land to be acquired, the Hanover Square Property at No. 14 Hanover Square is located to the north of Hanover Square and to the west of Harewood Place. Hanover Square and Harewood Place are liable to very considerable disruption over a protracted period as a result of the works for the construction of the Bond Street Station Eastern Ticket Hall which will involve (amongst other things) the demolition of 18/19 Hanover Square at the corner of Tenterden Street and extensive boring and tunnelling works to construct the new ticket hall. This requires the use of the western side of Hanover Square for a major construction site. Hanover Square and Harewood Place will be the route of very considerable construction traffic.
  
- 15 Although 14 Hanover Square falls outside the limits of land to be acquired, your Petitioners are very apprehensive at the possibility of settlement impacts affecting the Hanover Square Property which is located very close to the properties, namely 20 Hanover Square, which has been identified as being likely to be subject to significant effects as a result of settlement; and 24 Hanover Square which has been identified as potentially liable to significant effects from settlement. Your Petitioners request that the Promoter is put to proof that no effects of settlement are likely to affect the Hanover Square Property and that if there is a prospect of such settlement, appropriate protective provisions are available in respect of it.

*Subsidence, settlement and associated damage to properties during and after construction*

- 16 Your Petitioners are particularly concerned about settlement effects on the Brook Street and Oxford Street Properties, in addition to the Hanover Square Property and envisage that significant damage could be caused to such properties as a result of the works. Further, your Petitioners submit that the Promoter should be constrained to construct the works proposed beyond, or, so far as practicable, away from the subsoil and undersurface of the Brook Street and Oxford Street Properties in such a way as to avoid or, if necessary, minimise any diminution in the load-bearing qualities of that undersurface and subsoil. Your Petitioners further request, insofar as the subsoil and undersurface beneath their properties may be affected, that they may nevertheless continue to have the facility to construct such foundations as may be necessary to support development on the site and that the compulsory purchase powers which are proposed be limited accordingly. Furthermore, your Petitioners will argue that they should be properly compensated by the Promoter for any loss of development value of any of their properties and that they should be fully indemnified in respect of any additional design or construction costs incurred by your Petitioners in carrying out such development.
- 17 Tunnelling of underground station boxes and related facilities is proposed to be carried out using the Sprayed Concrete Lining (SCL) method, which has been attributed to a number of tunnel collapses in the past. Your Petitioners seek assurance that this technique is to be carried out correctly, and seek to ensure that appropriate independent review of the methodology is carried out prior to the tunnels being constructed, and that sufficient independent controls are in place during construction.
- 18 Your Petitioners humbly submit that the Promoter should be required, inter alia:—
- (a) to take all practical measures to prevent damage and injurious effects, including constructing the proposed works at the greatest practical depth;
  - (b) to carry out prior subsoil investigation and survey;
  - (c) to conduct at their own expense a full survey of the condition of the Brook Street and Oxford Street Properties and the Hanover Square Property both

before and after the construction and before and after the commencement of operation of the works, with details of all such surveys being provided to your Petitioners;

- (d) to submit plans and detailed proposals (including confirmation of anticipated ground and building movements, as well as notification of proposed construction methods) for the works under or affecting the Brook Street and Oxford Street Properties and the Hanover Square Property to your Petitioners for their reasonable approval and to give your Petitioners proper notice of the commencement of and full consultation upon all works affecting your Petitioners;
- (e) to agree a threshold with your Petitioners for ground and building movement within the vicinity of the Brook Street and Oxford Street Properties and the Hanover Square Property, to the effect that if that threshold is exceeded the Promoter should be obliged to cease construction until such time as remedial measures are in place which will minimise settlement affecting such properties;
- (f) to agree necessary safeguarding or remedial measures with your Petitioners, to be carried out at the expense of the Promoter;
- (g) to use all available grouting, de-watering, freezing and pressure-working methods; and
- (h) to carry out agreed underpinning and strengthening works.

19 In addition, your Petitioners require continuous monitoring of the Brook Street and Oxford Street Properties and the Hanover Square Property to be undertaken during construction of the works and for arrangements to be made for the carrying out of remedial works at the Promoter's expense. All of these matters should be agreed with your Petitioners before such properties are allowed to be interfered with.

*Noise, vibration, disruption and disturbance during the construction period*

20 Noise and vibration arising from the construction and operation of the railway and its associated works and structures (such as ventilation shafts) also concern your

Petitioners. Your Petitioners submit that the Promoter should be compelled to use best available techniques in the construction (and operation) of the railway and its associated works and structures to ensure that these adverse effects are minimised. Furthermore, your Petitioners wish to see strict construction standards set to which the Promoter must be made liable to comply.

- 21 Your Petitioners are concerned about dust and dirt produced during construction of the proposed works. Your Petitioners would wish to see binding commitments imposed on the Promoter to require adherence to agreed measures to reduce dust, and to carry out additional mitigation if dust continues to be a nuisance to your Petitioners' properties. Your Petitioners request that provision be made to ensure that the Promoter takes responsibility for the reimbursement of your Petitioners for additional expense caused by dust and dirt such as more frequent cleaning of their affected properties, and more frequent replacement of air conditioning filters.
- 22 The surface works, particularly the use of working sites and the removal of spoil, will further impact upon the quiet enjoyment of all your Petitioners' properties (especially the Brook Street and Hanover Square Properties). Major increases in lorry movements during the construction period are to be expected, the disruptive effect of which will be compounded by the permanent and temporary stopping up of nearby roads.
- 23 Your Petitioners have most severe reservations about the proposed work sites at Davies Street, Dering Yard, Tenterden Street, Hanover Square, Finsbury Circus and Liverpool Street. Your Petitioners apprehend that these sites and the works proposed to be carried out within them will bring about a general disturbance and loss of amenity to the areas involved, arising especially from—
- (a) the temporary road closures proposed;
  - (b) construction traffic;
  - (c) restricted access to buildings (including some of your Petitioners' properties);
  - (d) construction noise and vibration; and
  - (e) visual impact.

24 Your Petitioners are concerned about the effect of these matters on your Petitioners' properties and having regard to the scale of disruption and disturbance envisaged your Petitioners seek protection in relation thereto. In particular, in the Hanover Square worksite vicinity, the Environmental Statement predicts during a peak construction duration of 47 weeks, 60 (peak) construction lorry movements and 24 (non-peak) construction lorry movements per day between New Bond Street and Hanover Square. Furthermore, during the three construction periods at the Hanover Square worksite (each of approximately 1, 2 and 8 months respectively) around 60, 60 and 70 lorries respectively will access the Hanover Square worksite.

25 Your Petitioners expect and request the Promoter to be bound to a code of construction practice to regulate these matters and to ameliorate any adverse effects caused by the works. Your Petitioners submit that the Promoter should consult with them about proposed working methods and in relation to all aspects of likely environmental impact to your Petitioners' properties and that the Promoter should be obliged to agree a scheme of work with your Petitioners for the benefit of the occupiers of your Petitioners' properties, such scheme of work to include, amongst other things, reference to noise, vibration, disruption and lorry movements.

*Vehicular and pedestrian access*

26 Your Petitioners note the obligation under paragraph 5(2) of Schedule 3 to the Bill to provide reasonable access for pedestrians going to or from premises abutting a highway that is proposed to be temporarily stopped up. Your Petitioners request that good and open access be maintained in all other cases as well, such as in the event of the erection of hoardings and scaffolding, use of the footway next to the properties, the placing of equipment and apparatus there, and the parking, loading and unloading of vehicles. Your Petitioners particularly request that vehicular and pedestrian access to the Brook Street and Oxford Street Properties and the Hanover Square Property be maintained where practicable, due to their status as high exposure and visible retail premises and that compensation be awarded for any costs incurred through the inability to service or park at these properties due to the works.

### *Compensation*

- 27 Your Petitioners further humbly submit that such provisions with regard to compensation in respect of compulsory acquisition and other matters as are proposed in the Bill are inadequate to compensate your Petitioners for the loss, damage and inconvenience which they might suffer as a result of the construction and subsequent use of the proposed works. Further provisions should, they submit, be included in the Bill, including provisions respecting the making and assessment of claims for compensation, and indemnifying your Petitioners for any loss they might suffer as the result of unfavourable rent reviews respecting the leases currently affecting some of their properties insofar as the reduced rent payable (as it may differ from open market rent) is attributable to the proposed works and their effect on your Petitioners' properties (including, but not limited to, the Brook Street and Oxford Street Properties and the Hanover Square Property) or for any loss (so attributable) which your Petitioners might suffer in the event of them not being able to re-let their properties generally (in whole or in part) to existing or new tenants or in the event of them only being able to do so at a reduced premium or rent.
- 28 Your Petitioners also object to the compensation provisions of the Bill in that those provisions are totally inadequate to compensate your Petitioners in circumstances where no land (or interests in land) over the properties is acquired by the Promoter under the Bill, but where the value of such land and the properties erected thereon is reduced or where such land and the properties erected thereon is otherwise adversely or injuriously affected by the construction or use of the proposed works. Your Petitioners therefore submit that the Bill should be amended to provide adequate compensation in this regard.
- 29 Your Petitioners submit that they should also be entitled to make their claim for compensation in respect of damage arising to any of their properties by the execution of the works, or for injurious affection thereof by the execution or working of those works, separately from any claim for compensation in respect of the acquisition of any land (or interests therein) from your Petitioners under the powers of acquisition in the Bill and that any such deferred claim should be permitted to be made at any time

before the expiry of 5 years following the opening of the relevant part of the proposed railway to public traffic.

*General concerns*

- 30 Your Petitioners respectfully submit that the proposals contained in the Bill are causing a blight on your Petitioners' properties (including, but not limited to, the Brook Street and Oxford Street Properties and the Hanover Square Property). They are already blighted by the proposals contained in the Bill. Your Petitioners fear that prospective purchasers and lessees will state that the proposals would so blight the properties that they would not be interested in acquiring any part of them, or that prospective or existing lessees will demand a considerably reduced rent, due to the prospect of the works. Moreover, the Bill does not contain adequate provisions for compensating such blight and your Petitioners respectfully suggest that it should do so.
- 31 Your Petitioners submit that the Promoter should be required to indemnify them from all claims and demands which may be made in consequence of the construction, use or maintenance of the works under the Bill, or their failure or want of repair, or in consequence of any act or omission of the Promoter, his contractors or agents in carrying out the works under the Bill.
- 32 Your Petitioners submit that provision should be made for the Promoter to repay to your Petitioners all proper costs, charges and expenses (including the proper fees of such professional advisers as they may instruct) reasonably incurred in consequence of the Bill or of any provision made as a result of this Petition.
- 33 There are other clauses and provisions in the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand, would prejudicially affect your Petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioners.

*Conclusion*

34 Your Petitioners submit that the Bill fails adequately to safeguard and protect their interests and those of their lessees and tenants, and so should not be allowed to pass into law without these issues being addressed.

YOUR PETITIONERS THEREFORE HUMBLY PRAY 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 themselves, Counsel or Agents and with witnesses in support of the allegations of this Petition against so much of the Bill as affects the property, rights and interests of your Petitioners and in support of other such clauses and provisions as may be necessary or expedient for their protection or that such other relief may be given to your Petitioners in the premises as your Honourable House shall deem meet.

AND YOUR PETITIONERS WILL EVER PRAY, &c.

IN PARLIAMENT  
HOUSE OF COMMONS  
SESSION 2005–06

CROSSRAIL BILL

P E T I T I O N

of

GREAT PORTLAND ESTATES PLC,  
COLLIN ESTATES LIMITED,  
G.P.E. (61 ST MARY AXE) LIMITED,  
G.P.E. (80 BISHOPSGATE) LIMITED,  
G.P.E. (88/104 BISHOPSGATE) LIMITED,  
HARTSTAND LIMITED,  
ILEX LIMITED,  
J.L.P INVESTMENT COMPANY LIMITED,  
PONTSARN INVESTMENTS LIMITED,  
THE GREAT VICTORIA PARTNERSHIP  
(G.P) (No.2) LIMITED; AND  
THE GREAT VICTORIA PARTNERSHIP  
(G.P) LIMITED

Against, the Bill – On Merits –

Praying to be heard by Counsel, &c.