

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 Nicholas Skelton, Marybelle Skelton, Frances McDonnell, Lewis Holroyd, Marie Abrahams, Christopher Rice, Caroline Newell, Anthony King, Sharon King, Laurie Mascott, Kate Rice, Sally Askey, Stephen Maloney, Kirsten Alderton, David Alderton, Denise Maloney, Suzanne Keyte, Daniel Griffin, Mary Griffin, Claire Firmin, Christopher Firmin, Celia Pope, Marie Buchanan, Ian Buchanan, Carol Fellowes, Christopher Fellowes, Colin Davis, Gillian Davis, Geoffrey Holroyd, Brian Smith, Tracy Smith, Carol Collison, Peter Chadburn, Kathy Dobbin, Edward Griffin, Laurel Salt, Tina Hannan, Joseph O'Sullivan, Trevor Newman, Helen Ingram, Joanna Philpin, Carol Duff, Susan Stiff, Priscilla Hilton-Jones, Amrit Gill, Sonja Vao, Arthur Tucker, Anna Tucker.

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 Petitioners object 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 Petitioners also object 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 Petitioners also object to Clause 19 - Control of construction sites: appeals.
6. Your Petitioners also object to Clause 20 - Proceedings in respect of statutory nuisance: defence.
7. Your Petitioners also object to Clause 11 - Permitted development: time limit.
8. Your Petitioners are owners and/or residents of properties in the close vicinity of the proposed platform lengthening works at Hanwell railway station.
9. Your Petitioners and their rights, interests and property are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioners object for reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.
10. Your Petitioners object 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 and heritage 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 Petitioners object to the proposal to extend the platform at Hanwell station. Hanwell is one of 13 stations where Crossrail proposes to extend platforms. The existing platform is more than adequate. Automatic Selective Door Opening (SDO) equipment meets Rail Inspectorate safety requirements, would allow passengers access to and from designated carriages, and would have no environmental impact at Hanwell and presumably other stations proposed for platform lengthening.
12. Your Petitioners also object 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). 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 Petitioners also object because the loss of vegetation will significantly increase noise from passing trains as experienced by

nearby properties. The track at Hanwell is elevated some 6 metres above ground level, and the increased level of noise cannot easily be mitigated by the use of double glazing, as these properties are within a conservation area. The use of secondary double glazing would not suit these period properties.

14. Your Petitioners also object because the permanent loss of vegetation will allow both workman and rail passengers views into private property, 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 Petitioners believe that this contravenes Article 8. The restriction on privacy of 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. Construction noise, pollution and vibrations, coupled with equipment and material transport to the sites (and resulting parking restrictions), will also impact on residents' homes and private lives. Crossrail has not contacted residents who would be directly affected.
15. Your Petitioners also object because no 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 Petitioners submit 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. Crossrail users leaving the trains at Hanwell could be restricted to designated carriages. The same could apply at other stations where there are proposals to lengthen platforms.
17. Your Petitioners further submit that if the proposal to lengthen the platform at Hanwell station remains within the Bill, the Bill should await a study by Crossrail to assess the impact on all local residents of extending the platform partly to the east where less vegetation and habitat will be lost. In the alternative, your Petitioners submit that 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 Petitioners further submit 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 Petitioners further submit 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.
20. Your Petitioners further submit 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 Petitioners further submit 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.
22. Your Petitioners further submit 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.
23. Your Petitioners further 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 this Bill.
24. For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioners respectfully submit that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, clauses 11, 15, 18, 19 and 20 so far affecting your Petitioners, 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 Petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioners.
26. Your Petitioners submit that, in the respects mentioned and in other respects, the Bill fails adequately to safeguard and protect the interests of your Petitioners.

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 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 Petitioners and in support of such other 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.

