

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SESSION 2005/06

CROSSRAIL

PETITION

of

DEREK JAMES HURST

AGAINST

BY COUNSEL ETC.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SESSION 2005-06

CROSSRAIL

PETITION

Against the Bill – Praying to be heard by counsel etc.,

TO THE HONOURABLE THE COMMONS OF THE UNITED
KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND IN
PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED.

THE HUMBLE PETITION OF DEREK JAMES HURST

SHEWETH as follows:

1. A Bill (hereinafter called “the Bill”) has been introduced into and is now pending in your honourable House entitled “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. Clauses 1 to 20 set out the Bill’s objectives in relation to the construction and operation of the railway transport system mentioned in paragraph 1 above. They include provision for compulsory acquisition, planning permission, heritage issues, trees and noise. Clauses 21 to 44 of the Bill establish a regulatory regime for the railway transport system and Clauses 45 to 59 of the Bill deal with miscellaneous and general provisions.
- 3 The works proposed to be authorised by the Bill are specified in Schedule 1 to the Bill and the scheduled works are defined in the Bill as the works specified in Schedule 1 to the Bill which are works authorised to be constructed by the nominated undertaker (defined in the Bill)
4. Your Petitioner is Derek James Hurst of 71 Friars Avenue, Shenfield, Essex, CM15 8HU. This property is a 2/3 bedroom semi-detached house and I am the sole occupier.

5. Your Petitioner's house backs onto the site of the proposed works at and adjacent to Shenfield station. According to the Environmental Statement deposited with the Bill, residents of Friars Avenue will be significantly affected by noise and/or visual impact to the extent that some residents may be eligible for insulation or even rehousing.
6. Your Petitioner and his rights interests and property will be injuriously affected by the proposals in the Bill to which your Petitioner objects for the reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.
7. Your Petitioner understands that the proposed works at and near Shenfield station are estimated to take some 18 months to complete and it is conceivable that it could be longer. It is acknowledged in the Environmental Statement that his property will suffer significant noise and visual impact. As previously stated, he lives alone. He is elderly, does not enjoy good health and to be affected as mentioned for such a period would be a considerable strain.
8. Your Petitioner has no plans to move in the foreseeable future but feels that, if the proposed works are carried out with the impact on him as envisaged, then he may well be forced to do so and against his wishes. Furthermore, the property, like others in a similar situation, will be "blighted" with the result that a sale could take a long time to effect and even then only at a price below normal market value. It is understood that the proposed works would be expected to start in 2007 and in that event with completion in 2009, the "blight" would last for some 4 years from now.
9. Your Petitioner does not drive and thus relies to a considerable extent on rail travel from Shenfield station. Whilst no doubt during the course of the proposed works the rail operator will endeavour to run as normal a service as possible, it is inevitable that services will be disrupted with trains being delayed and cancelled. Further, there will be disruption to access to and from the station and with substantial noise and dirt. It must also be inevitable that at times the existing lifts between the concourse and the platforms, on which your Petitioner relies, will not be working.
10. A notable part of the proposed works at Shenfield station would

comprise an additional platform. Your Petitioner submits that there appears to be no necessity for this. There are already 5 platforms including one for the existing metro service which would be superceded by Crossrail.

11. Whilst acknowledging the benefits of rail travellers being able to cross London without having to interchange there, your Petitioner submits that it is unnecessary to run the line to and from Shenfield. The new line would be a metro service serving every station along the whole route. There is already a metro service between Shenfield and Liverpool Street and also a frequent fast service between those stations with most fast trains stopping at Stratford. Your Petitioner submits that the best course would be to run Crossrail from Stratford. The only disadvantage is that passengers would have to alight at Stratford and join the alternative there. Any time difference would be minimal (it could even be quicker) and a small price to pay for avoiding the proposed work at Shenfield.
12. There are other clauses and provisions in the Bill which, if passed into law as they stand, will prejudicially affect the rights and interest of your Petitioner and other clauses and provisions necessary for his protection and benefit are omitted therefrom.

YOUR PETITIONER THEREFORE
HUMBLY PRAYS

your Honourable House that the Bill may not pass into law as it now stands and that he be heard by himself or 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 amendments as may be necessary and proper for his protection and benefit,

AND YOUR PETITIONER WILL EVER
PRAY ETC.