



IN PARLIAMENT  
HOUSE OF COMMONS  
SESSION 2004-05

**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  
Jean Lambert MEP  
Darren Johnson, London Assembly Member  
Jenny Jones, London Assembly Member  
John Foster  
Janet Petherwick  
Howard Gould  
Graham J Lee

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 clauses 1, 22 and 23 and Schedule 1 of the bill.
4. Your petitioners object to the powers proposed to be given to the Secretary of State to direct the Office of rail Regulation in clauses 22 and 23.
5. Your petitioners object to the omission of a railway from Old Oak Common to Uxbridge via South Ruislip and the omission of a railway from Greenford East Junction to West Ealing Junction in clause 1 and Schedule 1.
6. Your petitioners object to the omission of a railway from Heathrow T5 station west and then north along the old GW Staines branch to rejoin the GWML with a west facing junction near Iver in clause 1 and Schedule 1.
7. Your petitioners object to the omission of a railway from Canal Way,

Ladbroke Grove to Richmond via Willesden Jn, the South West line and the North London Line in clause 1 and Schedule 1.

8. Your petitioners object to the omission of a railway from Windsor to Slough in clause 1 and Schedule 1.
9. Your petitioners object to the closure of any freight sidings currently in use, in particular Paddington New Yard in clause 1 and Schedule 1.
10. Your petitioners object to the omission of a 5th track for a reversible loop on the sections from Airport Jn to Hanwell Bridge and Hanwell station to the proposed Acton Yard junction in clause 1 and Schedule 1.
11. Your petitioners object to the use of allotment land as work sites at Noel Rd allotments and Great Western Allotments in clause 1 and Schedule 1
12. Your petitioners object to the omission of stations at Old Oak Common, Park Royal and Perivale in clause 1 and Schedule 1
13. Your petitioners object to the provision of turn back sidings at Westbourne Park in clause 1 and Schedule 1
14. Your petitioners object to the omission of turn back sidings at Old Oak Common in clause 1 and Schedule 1.
15. Your petitioners object to the omission of a grade separated junction where Crossrail trains would join the Relief lines out of Paddington in clause 1 and Schedule 1.
16. Your petitioners object to the larger shaft at Hanbury St, Spitalfields so that tunnel boring machines (TBM) can be lowered in there, the extraction of spoil via a side tunnel to Pedley St, a conveyor to Mile End Park and the storage of spoil in Mile End Park in clause 1 and Schedule 1.
17. Your petitioners object to the provision of a depot and underpass at Romford in clause 1 and Schedule 1.
18. Your petitioners object to the omission of a station at Woolwich.
19. Your petitioners object to the omission of a railway from Abbey Wood to Dartford and Ebbsfleet in clause 1 and Schedule 1.
20. Your petitioners object to the omission of a railway from Romford to Ebbsfleet in clause 1 and Schedule 1.
21. Your Petitioner Jean Lambert is a member of the European Parliament representing London electors
22. Your Petitioner Darren Johnson is a member of the London Assembly representing London electors
23. Your Petitioner Jenny Jones is a member of the London Assembly

representing London electors

24. Your Petitioner John Foster is a resident of Antill Rd, Bow.
25. Your Petitioner Janet Petherwick is a resident of Beechfield Gardens, Romford.
26. Your Petitioner Howard Gould is a resident of Stockland Rd, Romford.
27. Your Petitioner Graham J Lee is a resident of Brixham Crescent, Ruislip.
28. 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.
29. Your petitioners object to the powers proposed to be given to the Secretary of State to direct the Office of Rail Regulation because Crossrail should be treated similarly to other passenger and freight train operators. The existing rights of other passenger and freight train operators should be protected by the Office of Rail Regulation. The bill gives the Secretary of State powers which could be injurious to other passenger and freight train operators. This would in turn adversely affect passengers and residents. Passengers would be adversely affected because their services would be less frequent and/or slower. Residents would be adversely affected because if freight transferred from rail to road, because there was insufficient paths allocated for freight trains, then pollution and congestion would be worsened by the extra lorries.
30. Your petitioners object to the powers proposed to be given to the Secretary of State to direct the Office of Rail Regulation to give Crossrail exclusive use of 2 tracks on GW (to Maidenhead) and GE (to Shenfield) lines. We object to this because there would not be capacity on the other pair of tracks for other services: on GW these are InterCity, Heathrow Express, regional passenger, freight; on GE these are InterCity, regional passenger, freight. One pair of tracks cannot handle this mixture of speeds and stopping patterns. Passengers and freight operators would be adversely affected.
31. Your petitioners object to the lack of provision of extra capacity on the GWML. If Crossrail needs a pair of tracks for its exclusive use on the GWML then an extra pair of tracks should be built as far as Airport Jn or Slough still leaving 4 tracks for other services. There is already demand for more passenger and freight services on the GWML. Crossrail should not prevent this demand from being met. At the very least more 5 track sections should be provided between Paddington and Airport Jn with a similar layout to that proposed between West Drayton and Langley so that some semi-fast regional passenger trains could pass all-stations Crossrail trains. Airport Jn to Hanwell Bridge and Hanwell station to West Ealing station (inclusive) should both be 5 track sections. This latter should be extended through Ealing Broadway station to the proposed Acton Yard junction.

32. Your petitioners object to the decrease in peak hours services between Twyford and Paddington. This would adversely affect passengers from Twyford itself and from all stations on the Henley branch. During peak hours 2 trains per hour which serve Twyford would terminate at Slough instead of Paddington. Passengers would have to change on to a Crossrail train at Slough. This would provide a slower and less convenient journey for passengers. Trains from Reading serving Twyford could continue to run all the way to Paddington if more tracks were provided between Airport Jn and Paddington and a grade separated junction at Westbourne Park.
33. Your petitioners support the principle of Crossrail as a London Metro service but wish to see more parts of east and west London benefit from Crossrail services. Extending Crossrail services to more parts of London will benefit London residents environmentally, socially and economically. Modal shift from cars to trains will reduce pollution and greenhouse gas emissions and improve the quality of the environment. Crossrail serving more stations will improve accessibility for many London residents, a social benefit. Crossrail serving more stations will improve access to regeneration areas and improve access to employment areas, an economic benefit.
34. Your petitioners object to over half the westbound trains terminating at Paddington and turning back in sidings at Westbourne Park, ie they would not serve west London. That is a wasted resource. Other branches should be included to make better use of these trains. These new routes propose improved public transport access in a swath of West London. They could include branches to Uxbridge (via South Ruislip), Castle Bar Park (anti-clockwise loop using Greenford branch), Windsor (via Slough) and Richmond (via Willesden Jn and NLL). These are mainly on existing or former railways with short linking spurs. Even if these branches are not included in phase 1 provision for them, with appropriate junctions, should be made in phase 1.
35. Your petitioners object to the closure of any freight sidings currently in use and to the loss of any paths used by freight trains on the GW and GE ML slow lines. More loops and 5 track sections should be constructed to create more capacity for freight trains and Crossrail and other TOC passenger trains. Residents would be adversely affected because if freight transferred from rail to road, because there was insufficient paths allocated for freight trains or freight sidings were closed, then pollution and congestion would be worsened by the extra lorries. A freight depot at Westbourne Park is proposed to be closed for the construction of the Westbourne Park turnback facility. That turnback facility should not be built and the freight depot should be retained. If a turnback facility is required it should be located at a new station at Old Oak Common.
36. Your petitioners object to the omission of a railway from Old Oak Common to Uxbridge via South Ruislip. A Crossrail service on this route would provide improved access to residential areas and the regeneration area at Park Royal. It would encourage modal shift from cars to rail and so would benefit the environment. The existing railways from Old Oak

Common West junction to a new junction near Ruislip Gardens (Wycombe line) and the Metropolitan line from Ickeham to Uxbridge together with a connecting chord located under sidings at the LU Central line Ruislip depot would become part of Crossrail.

37. Your petitioners object to the proposed withdrawal of direct services between stations on the Greenford branch (Greenford, South Greenford, Castle Bar Park and Drayton Green) and Paddington. Passengers to and from those stations would have to change at West Ealing. These stations should be served by Crossrail trains operating an anti-clockwise loop service via Park Royal, the Greenford branch and Ealing Broadway. This would retain a direct service between Paddington and stations on the Greenford branch. The existing railways from Old Oak Common West junction to Greenford East Junction (Wycombe line) and Greenford East Junction to West Ealing Junction (Greenford branch) would become part of Crossrail.
38. Your petitioners object to the omission of a railway from Heathrow T5 station west and then north along the old GW Staines branch to rejoin the GWML with a west facing junction near Iver. This would allow Heathrow express and/or Crossrail Heathrow services to be extended to Slough or Windsor. Slough would provide a more convenient interchange for passengers from GWML stations to the west of London than Hayes & Harlington. Improved public transport access to Heathrow from the west would lead to a reduction in road traffic in the Heathrow area. Heathrow is the most polluted area outside central London due to emissions from planes and road vehicles. Modal shift from cars to trains will reduce pollution and greenhouse gas emissions and improve the quality of the environment.
39. Your petitioners object to the omission of a railway from Windsor to Slough as part of Crossrail. This would take over the existing railway together with a grade separated junction with the GWML somewhere between Iver and Slough. Improved public transport access between Windsor, Heathrow and central London would lead to a reduction in road traffic in the Heathrow area and a reduction in air pollution.
40. Your petitioners object to the omission of a railway from Mitre Bridge to Old Oak Common West junction and a grade separated junction at Old Oak Common West junction. The bill proposes a 2 track railway for Crossrail from the tunnel portal at Royal Oak as far as Mitre Bridge. This should be extended approximately 1000 metres west to Old Oak Common West junction. At Old Oak Common West junction there should be a grade separated junction which would allow Crossrail trains to join the Relief lines on the GWML and Crossrail trains to join the Wycombe line without conflicting moves. These works would allow more trains, both Crossrail and other TOCs, to use the line between Old Oak Common and Paddington enabling more passengers to travel by train and so reduce car use and the consequent pollution.
41. Your petitioners object to the omission of a grade separated junction where Crossrail trains would join the Relief lines out of Paddington. The

bill proposes a flat junction at Westbourne Park. This would cause operating difficulties affecting performance, decrease the number of peak hours services that can be provided between Twyford and Paddington and would make it difficult for more Crossrail trains to go further west at some later stage. This should be a grade separated junction either at Westbourne Park or it could be moved further west to Old Oak Common and combined with the junction for the branch to Uxbridge along the Wycombe line.

42. Your petitioners object to the omission of stations at Old Oak Common, Park Royal and Perivale. Stations at these locations would provide improved access to residential and employment areas and to the regeneration area at Park Royal.
43. Your petitioners object to the use of allotment land as work sites at Noel Rd allotments and Great Western Allotments. These allotments provide good quality and affordable vegetables and fruit and an important green oasis in an otherwise heavily built up area of London. Allotments need to be recognised for their environmental, health and social benefits and their genuine contribution to community life. These allotments should be retained and work sites should be found within the existing Acton Yard area.
44. Your petitioners object to the larger shaft at Hanbury St, Spitalfields so that tunnel boring machines (TBM) can be lowered in there, the extraction of spoil via a side tunnel to Pedley St, a conveyor to Mile End Park and the storage of spoil in Mile End Park. The extraction of spoil via a side tunnel to Pedley St and the conveyor to Mile End Park would cause disturbance to residents of dwellings all along the route of the conveyor from Pedley St to Mile End Park, approximately 2 kilometres. The storage of spoil in Mile End Park would cause disturbance to local residents and would be a loss of green space during the construction period. Tunnel boring should be from the tunnel portals with spoil removed via the portals. However if the tunnel boring machines (TBM) are to be inserted at Hanbury St the side tunnel should go to the former Bishopsgate goodsyard site instead of Pedley St. This area is currently derelict, some of the old goodsyard having been demolished to make way for ELLX. Part of the site could be used for spoil storage. The train loading facility could be on the part of the old goodsyard site that has not been demolished. A siding from the GEML would be installed on the old arches that formerly carried the railway into the Bishopsgate goodsyard. These arches and some of those on the GEML west of Mile End may need to be strengthened to take the heavy spoil removal trains.
45. Your petitioners object to the omission of a railway from Abbey Wood to Dartford and Ebbsfleet. This railway was included in earlier proposals for Crossrail. It should be re-instated into the bill. It would improve public transport access to parts of SE London and North Kent. The new Ebbsfleet station should be a major interchange station. The Crossrail station should be at the same place as the new CTRL station not, as originally planned, 500 metres away.

46. Your petitioners object to the omission of a station at Woolwich. The bill safeguards land at Woolwich for a Crossrail station but does not propose a station there or make passive provision for a station there. A Woolwich Crossrail station would be in tunnel and so would be disruptive and expensive to build later after Crossrail had started operating. A station is required here to provide good public transport access to homes and businesses on the former Woolwich Arsenal site. The Woolwich Crossrail station should be included in the bill. At the very least the bill should include passive provision, ie a station box, at Woolwich.
47. Your petitioners object to the omission of a railway from Romford to Ebbsfleet. There should be a Crossrail line between Romford and Ebbsfleet, connecting together the two branches to the east, to form a loop via a new tunnel under the Thames at Northfleet. This would serve and link parts of Thames Gateway north and south of the river. Even if this loop is not included in phase 1 provision for it, with appropriate junctions, should be made. The loop would use the existing lines between Romford and Upminster and Upminster and Grays.
48. Your petitioners object to the provision of a depot and underpass at Romford in clause 1 and Schedule 1. A depot at this location would cause disturbance, especially at night, to residents in nearby dwellings. We also object to the loss of greenfield land at Westlands Playing Fields and Westlands Rough. The depot for Crossrail should be sited at Ilford, North Pole or Old Oak Common. The existing users of the depot at Ilford could be relocated to somewhere further out on the Great Eastern mainline, Colchester and Ipswich both have under utilised railway land. North Pole depot is currently used by Eurostar but it will move to a new depot at Temple Mills in 2007 leaving North Pole vacant. The Heathrow Express depot could move from Old Oak Common to North Pole (ie to the other side of the mainline) and Crossrail could then use the current Heathrow Express depot and other nearby sidings at Old Oak Common.

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 Petitioner in the premises as your Honourable House shall deem meet.