

HOUSE OF COMMONS
SESSION 2005-06

CROSSRAIL

PETITION
of

Mr Michael Peter Kingshott & Mrs Janet Ann Kingshott.

**AGAINST,
BY COUNSEL, &c.**

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SESSION 2005-06

CROSSRAIL

PETITION

Against the Bill – 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 Mr M.P.Kingshott & Mrs. A.K.Kingshott.

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 and hereinafter referred to as "the nominated undertaker").
4. Your Petitioners are Mr M.P.Kingshott and Mrs J.A.Kingshott of 75 Friars Avenue Shenfield. Mr Kingshott is retired and Mrs Kingshott is employed in Shenfield .
5. Your Petitioners rights interests and property will be injuriously affected by the proposals in the bill to which your Petitioners object, for the reasons,amongst others,hereinafter appearing
6. Your Petitioners house backs onto the railway and is adjacent to a house designated as one to be affected by significant construction noise. It will therefore still be affected by construction noise and the increased number of warning hoots to the construction workers from the very frequent passing trains. This will significantly decrease the amenity value of the garden which your Petitioner has hitherto enjoyed
7. Your Petitioners make frequent use of the shops and Library in Shenfield and will have to traverse the entrance to the works site at

the bottom of Friars Avenue which will be noisy, dusty and congested, to shop in an area which will also be noisy, dusty and congested.

8. Mrs. Kingshott's employment may also be terminated with the consequent loss of income if the noise, dust, and lack of parking amenity results in a loss of business at her place of work.
9. The loss of parking areas, the increased construction traffic, and the serious environmental impact on the Shenfield shopping and office areas will inevitably result in loss of business as people look for less stressful and more convenient places to shop. Businesses are already considering the potential effect and whether to renew their leases. This could have a permanent adverse effect on this hitherto pleasant well served area. In many parts of the country we have seen the demise of local individual shops as they give way to out of town shopping. The proposed construction plan in its present form may hasten this in Shenfield.
10. Your Petitioners moved from inner London to enjoy the pleasant village atmosphere of Shenfield as they approached retirement and would be affected by any permanent reduction in amenities in Shenfield resulting from this loss of business.
11. The value of your petitioners property has already been adversely affected by the expectation of a long period of disruption in the area if the current plan of work goes ahead. Should they for any reason have to move during this time they will suffer a financial loss.
12. Your Petitioner while accepting the benefits of crossrail to Greater London can see no significant virtue in its extension to Shenfield bearing in mind the environmental impact on Shenfield and its residents. Your Petitioner suggests that the Proposes therefore

consider a cheaper and less disruptive location for their terminus either closer to or further out of London.

13. There are other clauses and provisions in the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand, will prejudicially affect the rights and interest of your Petitioners and other clauses and provisions necessary for their protection and benefit are omitted there from.

YOUR PETITIONER[S]
THEREFORE

HUMBLY PRAY

your Honourable House that the Bill may not pass into law as it now stands and that they be heard by themselves 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 Petitioners and in support of such other clauses and amendments as may be necessary and proper for their protection and benefit.

AND YOUR PETITIONERS will ever pray, &c.