



IN PARLIAMENT  
HOUSE OF COMMONS  
SESSION 2005-2006

**CROSSRAIL BILL**

**PETITION**

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 CLIVE DAVID DIEBELIUS

SHEWETH as follows:-

1. A Bill (hereinafter called "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 presented by Mr Secretary Darling, supported by The Prime Minister, Mr Chancellor of the Exchequer, Secretary Margaret Beckett, Secretary Peter Hain, Secretary Alan Johnson, Secretary Tessa Jowell, and Derek Twigg.
3. 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 clause 45 to 59 of the Bill deal with miscellaneous and general provisions.

4. 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").  
The Petitioner Clive Diebelius resides at no. 41a Southern Way, Romford RM7 9PB. The Bill would authorise the construction and operation of the railway system and its associated development through Romford and your petitioner objects to the part of the works outlined below.
5. The Petitioner does not object in principle to the decision to construct a cross London rail link, however the Petitioner objects to the works proposed to be carried out as referred to above.
6. The rights of the petitioner are directly or indirectly affected by the works referred to above. The petitioner's interests and property are injuriously affected by the Bill.

**Westlands Playing Fields and Westlands Rough.**

7. Objection is taken to the works proposed to be undertaken in Romford between Whalebone Lane (A112) to the west to Jutsums Lane to the east. Those works consist mainly of a new rail underpass (dive-under), access tracks and sidings at Westlands Playing Fields and Westlands Rough to access the train depot.
8. The new railway lines and railway underpass (dive-under) at Westlands Playing Fields and Westlands Rough will create unacceptable views for the large number of residents and schoolchildren in this area.
9. Noise arising from the trains as they pass into and out of the underpass (dive-under) at Westlands Playing Fields and Westlands Rough is a serious concern.

**Loss of Greenbelt and Green Corridor**

10. The loss of this greenbelt land caused by the new railway lines and underpass (dive-under) is of particular concern to the petitioner given the paucity of green areas in Romford and the importance of retaining greenbelt land in this densely-urban location.
11. Furthermore, this land is used as a green corridor for flora and fauna and should be conserved in the interests of nature conservation. Its loss would be contrary to the London bio-diversity plan.

12. The area of Westlands Rough is the last remaining piece of the Dagenham corridor left within Havering and is unique to this part of Havering.
13. The Petitioner contends that Crossrail have not sufficiently surveyed Westlands Rough and have also relied on outdated reports. The content of Crossrails Environment survey omits many species of flora and fauna that have been recorded on the site and is therefore incomplete. Some of the species recorded, which include lizards, slow worms, stag beetles and bats are protected by the 1981 Wildlife Act and are unique to this part of Havering.
14. The Petitioner is concerned regarding the construction of the underpass (dive-under) at Westlands Playing Fields and Westlands Rough. It is proposed that a box will be constructed off site and pushed into position under the main railway line. The only means to do this would be by construction of an on site thrusting slab. The Petitioner's concern is regarding the Green Belt land-take for such a construction and that land will not be returned to its original state after the thrusting slab is no longer required.
15. The Petitioner also queries the amount of land-take from Westlands Rough will be only 4%, as stated by Crossrail. Various drawings that the Petitioner has seen from Crossrail appear to show the land-take as being much greater.
17. The Petitioner objects to the loss of all established trees in the area from Westlands Playing Fields to Jutsums Lane Bridge.

#### **Loss of Recreational Land and Open Space**

18. The Petitioner considers that the loss of use of Westlands Playing Fields, Westlands Rough and Jutsums Recreation Ground both during the period of construction and thereafter is unacceptable and would conflict with current government policy which encourages an increase in mass participation in sport and physical activity. In addition it will significantly diminish the opportunity of schoolchildren to undertake outdoor sports.
19. The Petitioner considers the revised layout to the football pitches on Westlands Playing Fields as proposed by Crossrail to mitigate the effect of land-take on Westlands Playing Fields to be flawed. Crossrail has included an area for football pitches which is actually within the confines of the local school and therefore not available to Crossrail to include in their plans.

#### **Jutsums Lane**

20. The addition of a second bridge spanning Jutsums lane will exacerbate an already precarious but necessary route for pedestrians due to the lack of protection it affords from fast moving road traffic. Many schoolchildren use the footpath under this bridge to get to and from school.

21. The Petitioner is concerned regarding the potential loss of approx. 150 or more localised jobs in immediate Jutsums Lane area because of Crossrail land-take for the new railway lines running into the depot.

#### **Use of an Existing Depot as Alternative Site**

22. Objection is taken to the works proposed to be undertaken in Romford between Whalebone Lane (A112) in the west to Waterloo Road in the east. Those works consist mainly of a train maintenance depot, new sidings, and control centre on land to the south of Sheringham Avenue and Stockland Road.
23. It is not necessary to construct a train maintenance depot on the proposed site at Romford. It will be possible to use existing facilities for train maintenance at either Old Oak Common Depot or North Pole Depot on the Great Western Mainline Sites.
24. Additionally, the control centre proposed within the scope of this development could be sited independently from the depot at any new or existing site, space permitting.
25. The Petitioner notes that the assertion of the promoters that the only viable location for a depot is along the Great Eastern Line because this is where operating services will commence during the staged construction and opening of the railway. However, there is capacity on alternative railway lines in the west of London on which to undertake testing and commissioning of Crossrail services which can be serviced from either the existing depots of Old Oak Common or North Pole, the latter of which is to be vacated by EuroStar in 2007. The staged construction can be carried out from one of these existing depots.
26. The Petitioner is concerned about the harm to visual and residential amenity from the proposed new access road close to Beechfield Gardens.

#### **Noise and Disturbance**

27. There will be substantial interference from noise, vibration and increased activity in the vicinity of the train depot and control centre. The activities within the depot include the use of wheel lathes and carriage washing facilities. The noise of train brakes applied during the movement of rolling stock into and out of the sidings, stabling areas and depot will cause serious interference with living conditions. The houses, whose bedrooms are level with the trains, on roads such as Cotleigh and Stockland will in particular suffer substantial interference.

28. It is also averred that there will be serious disturbance from light used to illuminate the depot, surrounding sidings, car parks and access points.

#### **Overdevelopment of the Locality**

29. The Petitioner considers that the construction of the depot and control centre and their subsequent operation will lead to overdevelopment of this part of the Borough of Havering. The residents of Brooklands Ward have borne numerous developments and redevelopments in a small intensive area including an extensive new general hospital development. It is also currently being proposed to reuse and redevelop the old general hospital site. There have also recently been a number of new residential developments and more are in the planning stage in this locality.

#### **Costs of Proposed Depot, Underpass and Contaminated Land**

30. The Petitioner is aware that the current predicted cost of the proposed depot, underpass and necessitated ancillary development is £430 million. This inordinately high build cost is due to the development issues expected to be encountered, which includes the decontamination and removal of a gasometer. The final cost is likely to be much higher and therefore the Petitioner considers the use of an existing depot to be more cost-effective.
31. Whilst I appreciate that the return to economic use of contaminated areas of land is generally a benefit, use of this land is not, in my view acceptable as it is my understanding that this land has reverted to Greenfield status.

#### **Overprovision of Car Parking Spaces**

32. The Petitioner considers that the depot and control centre will provide an excess of car parking spaces not necessary for those developments. Such overprovision will not be conducive to the use of other transport modes and will positively encourage car use.

#### **Effect of Construction**

33. The time predicted for the construction of this proposed facility in the Romford area is between five and six years. The Petitioner considers that the effects on his living conditions for this length of time are unacceptable.
34. The Petitioner is concerned regarding blight affecting the value of his property during the construction of Crossrail.

### **Train Service.**

35. The Petitioner is a daily user on the current One Great Eastern train Service into Liverpool Street. Crossrail will increase the Petitioner's journey times.
36. The Petitioner is concerned with regard to the service disruption that will occur to his current train service during the construction of Crossrail and the latter introduction of Crossrail services.
37. The Petitioner questions the ability of Crossrail to run 48 trains during the morning between 7.00am and 10.00am as a joint service with One Great Eastern railway without the need to re-signal the line or having to make major modifications to one of the stations on the Great Eastern Line so trains can be turned around. The number of Trains that could run is not proven and the line is already running at near capacity.
38. The Petitioner would like the Committee to look into the possibility of upgrading the current One Great Eastern Service to 10 carriage trains. This will increase capacity into Liverpool Street by 25%. The only requirement would be for Platform lengthening and the modification to the track layout at Liverpool Street. This can be done without of vast investment in comparison to Crossrail.
39. The Petitioner would like the Committee to look at the possibility of terminating the Crossrail service at Stratford, as Stratford will be a hub for the Olympics and the current One Great Eastern train service would remain unaffected.
40. The Petitioner would like a guarantee that his Council Tax will not be surcharged to assist in paying for Crossrail.
41. The Petitioner would like a guarantee that train fares for Crossrail and One Great Eastern will be the same and that Crossrail fares will not be surcharged.
42. The Petitioner questions the need for Crossrail to run trains between Stratford and Shenfield replacing the One Great Eastern service. Given population trends the biggest redevelopment will be in the Thames Gateway. The petitioner raises the question as to why the Crossrail line is not running via the Thames Gateway. The Petitioner would like the Thames Gateway option surveyed in greater detail as it would appear that Crossrail have not undertaken a major survey or review in light of recent developments.

### **Bus Services.**

43. The Petitioner uses the local bus services and these will be seriously affected during Crossrail construction at Romford Station.

**Changes made by Crossrail after the Petitioning Period is over.**

44. The Petitioner is concerned that as recently as September 2005 Crossrail announced substantial changes to the proposed works. Crossrail have admitted to a technical error in mapping resulting in misrepresentation of affected areas. As a result of this Crossrail intends to make appropriate amendments to the Bill before Parliament and produce technical revisions after the closing date for the submission of Petitions. The Petitioner submits that the level of consultation by Crossrail in the Romford area has been inadequate and inconsistent throughout the process to date.
45. In light of the above, the Petitioner reserves the right to raise the above matters and any further matters of concern relating to the substance of the Crossrail Bill and this Petition that may arise from continuing discussions, the preparation and publication of reports, any possible revisions that may be made to current work site proposals or any other matters relevant to my expressed concerns that may occur in due course and prior to representation before the Select Committee.
46. For the foregoing and connected reasons I respectfully submit that, unless those clauses of the Bill referring to the proposed depot facility at Romford are removed or amended, then the Bill should not be allowed to pass into law.
47. There are other clauses and provisions in the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudice the Petitioners rights, (including my human rights) interests and my property and for which no provision is made to protect me and other clauses and provisions necessary for my protection and benefit are omitted therefrom.

I HUMBLY PRAY to the 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 such of the clauses and provisions of the Bill as 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 Petitioner in the premises as your Honourable House shall deem meet.

AND your Petitioners will ever pray, &c

