





THE RT HON THERESA MAY MP
Shadow Secretary of State
for the Family and for Culture, Media & Sport

350
HOUSE OF COMMONS
LONDON SW1A 0AA

IN PARLIAMENT
HOUSE OF COMMONS
SESSION 2005-06

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 Rt Hon Theresa May MP

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.

RELEVANT CLAUSES

- 3 Clauses 1 to 20 of the Bill allow for the construction of the planned works. Clauses 21 to 44 of the Bill deal with railway matter, making provision for modifications to the existing railway regulatory regime. Clauses 45-59 deal with miscellaneous and general matters.

YOUR PETITIONER AND HER INTEREST

- 4 Your Petitioner is the Member of Parliament for the Maidenhead constituency containing both Maidenhead and Twyford stations, both of

Tel: 020 7219 5206

Fax: 020 7219 1145

E-mail: mayt@parliament.uk





which are adversely affected by this Bill. Your petitioner resides within the area affected by the planned works and respectfully requests that she be heard both as a private citizen and also in her capacity as a Member of Parliament, in order to convey to the Committee the wider concerns of her constituents whose rights, interests and property are injuriously affected by this Bill, to which your petitioner objects for reasons hereinafter appearing.

CONCERNS

- 5 Your petitioner notes that the Promoter has published a document entitled "Maidenhead service improvements" which shows a journey time of 41 minutes for Crossrail trains travelling from Maidenhead to London Paddington. This is substantially longer than many commuters are used to, given that currently a number of trains are scheduled to complete the journey in less than 25 minutes. The petitioner's interests and those of her constituents would be adversely affected by such a substantial increase in journey time.
- 6 Clause 23 allows for minimum operating levels to be set for Crossrail passenger services and clauses 26 and 27 allow for the Office of Rail Regulation to modify existing access contracts to allow Crossrail passenger services to operate.
- 7 Your petitioner is deeply concerned that a minimum operating level could be set at such a level that it severely reduces the ability of the operator of the Greater Western Franchise to maintain and improve the standard of service from both Maidenhead and Twyford in both directions.
- 8 Your petitioner is equally concerned that a modification of existing access conditions could result in the operator of the Greater Western Franchise being forced to significantly reduce the number of trains operating from Twyford and from Maidenhead, in both directions.
- 9 Your petitioner is concerned that were such a reduction in service to take place a significant number of her constituents would be forced to seek alternative travel arrangements, generating additional congestion and adverse environmental effects.
- 10 Clauses 5 to 9 relate to the temporary acquisition of land and the extinguishment of rights of way in order to facilitate the Crossrail Development. Clauses 10 to 14 relate to the alteration of planning regulations in order to facilitate this development. Your Petitioner is concerned that the means of construction authorised by the Bill injuriously affect the quality of life enjoyed by her constituents.





- 11 Your Petitioner is concerned that the electrification of the Bridge in Maidenhead may injuriously affect this historic landmark, which contains the widest, flattest brick arches ever built.
- 12 Your Petitioner is concerned that the use of Guards Club Park and Guards Club Island during the construction process will injuriously affect the interests of those of her constituents who live nearby and those of her constituents who enjoy this amenity.
- 13 Your Petitioner is also concerned that the re-development of Maidenhead Train Station will adversely impact upon the character of the town.
- 14 Your Petitions believes that that the Bill should be amended so as to allow the Western terminus to be at Reading as opposed to Maidenhead. Reading is a major transport hub served by four different rail franchises, offering services to London Waterloo, the West Country, the South Coast and the North. Your petitioner respectfully submits that the inclusion of Reading within the Crossrail scheme, with fast and semi-fast Crossrail trains running to Paddington, would be a significant improvement.
- 15 There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect the rights, interests and property of your Petitioner's constituents, for which no adequate provision has been made.

YOUR PETITIONER therefore humbly prays 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 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.

