

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 THE
LONDON THAMES GATEWAY FORUM

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 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.

- 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 a membership organisation incorporated on 1st July 1987 as the Docklands Forum. Your petitioners are a registered company limited by guarantee without share capital, company number 02143893. Your petitioners changed their name, on 22nd May 2000, to the London Thames Gateway Forum of Community and Voluntary Organisations. Your petitioners are commonly known as the London Thames Gateway Forum or LTGF. Your petitioners have 483 member organisations spread across the London Boroughs of Southwark, Lewisham, Greenwich, Bexley, Bromley, Tower Hamlets, Newham, Barking & Dagenham, Havering, Redbridge and Walthamstow. The Bill would authorise the compulsory acquisition of land belonging to your Petitioner’s members, to which they object. Furthermore, part of the your Petitioners area of operation will be injuriously affected by the provisions of the Bill, and your Petitioners accordingly object thereto for the reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

- 5 Your Petitioners support the proposed Bill in general and welcome the decision to construct Crossrail. Your petitioners have taken a keen interest in and are committed to the development and promotion of public transport facilities, within the Thames Gateway area, which are important to improve access to homes, jobs, and other services. There are, however, a number of matters which cause great concern to your Petitioners, arising from the proposals in the Bill. Some of these points apply generally to the whole length of the line and some of the points are specific to particular sites. Your Petitioners are hopeful that many of their concerns can be met by agreement with the promoter.

- 6 Your petitioners object to the siting of a shaft at Hanbury Street, Tower Hamlets, in Schedule 7, because of the effect on the local community that,

rightly or wrongly, genuinely perceives Crossrail as being of no benefit to them. Your petitioners submit that the nominated undertaker should consider other locations for these works. Your petitioners submit that the nominated undertaker should familiarise itself with the needs and aspirations of the community at this location and use those concerns as the starting point for evaluating the proposed works. Furthermore your petitioners submit that the nominated undertaker should consider other locations for these works.

- 7 Your petitioners object to the siting of a shaft at Eleanor Street, Bow, Tower Hamlets, in Schedule 7, as this would lead to the eviction of the travellers' site at this location. The community is settled and integrated into the local community with children enrolled at local schools. Your petitioners submit that an alternative site should be found for the proposed shaft. Your petitioners submit that the nominated undertaker should, in consultation with the residents of the site, find and acquire another suitable site for the travellers.

- 8 Your petitioners are concerned regarding the scheduled work at Westland Playing Fields and adjacent land known as The Rough, Romford, Havering, in Schedule 7. Westland Playing Fields and 'The Rough' are important amenities to the Romford community. Areas of the playing fields will be lost over the construction period with the construction of an access road. Also, West Ham Football Club has been given the remainder of Westland playing fields to use for training, to replace the loss of their training grounds over the period. Alternative playing fields for users of Westland Playing Fields have been found at St George's Hospital in Hornchurch. This will be difficult for children to access as it is two bus rides away. Your petitioner submits that a better alternative than St George's Hospital should be found and that alternative arrangements should be made for West Ham Football Club.

- 9 Your petitioners are concerned regarding the scheduled work at Mile End Park, Tower Hamlets in Schedule 7. The north end of Mile End Park will be used to store excavated soil and rubble before its disposal. Tower Hamlets has few parks and open, green areas. The loss of this area represents a further

deprivation in this already deprived area. Your petitioners submit that alternative amenities should be made available to replace the facilities at Mile End Park.

- 10 Your petitioners are concerned regarding the construction of a new bridge and the effect of increased lorry traffic at Jutsums Lane, Havering. This road presently has a narrow footpath but is regarded as a safe walking route to school. Your petitioners submit that a new paragraph should be inserted into Schedule 14 requiring proper regard to be given to walking routes to school.
- 11 Your petitioners are concerned regarding the removal of trees at Jutsums Recreation Park, Havering, Clause 17. These trees are of public amenity value. Your petitioners submit that the clause should be amended to the effect that compensation is only payable where it is not feasible to replace trees of public amenity value in the vicinity of those removed.
- 12 Your petitioners object to the proposed stopping up, without an alternative being provided, of the footpath (FP123) between Beechfield Gardens and North Walk, Havering, Schedule 3: Highways Part 1. This forms part of the footpath between Jutsums Lane and Oldchurch Hospital at Nursery Walk. It is well used by local people. Your petitioners submit that the schedule should be amended to recognise that this is a footpath where an alternative needs to be provided.
- 13 Your petitioners are concerned regarding the lack of any mention in the Bill regarding the carriage of cycles on the trains to be run by the nominated operator. Your petitioners submit that a clause should be inserted requiring an appropriate level of provision to be made for cyclists.
- 14 Your petitioners are concerned regarding the lack of any mention in the Bill regarding the carriage of mobility impaired passengers on the trains to be run by the nominated operator. Your petitioners submit that a clause should be inserted requiring an appropriate level of provision to be made for those with mobility impairments.

- 15 Your petitioner is concerned that the Bill does not include plans to upgrade Maryland station to enable Crossrail trains to stop there. Your petitioners accordingly submit that requirement for additional works should be incorporated to the Bill, if enacted, including such road, railway and other construction works that may be deemed necessary to provide a new entrance to the station at Maryland with a fully accessible entrance to The Grove.
- 16 Your petitioner is concerned that the Crossrail proposals do not include plans to build a station at Woolwich. A station at Woolwich would help relieve the longstanding problem of overcrowding on trains passing through Blackheath, New Cross, Greenwich and Deptford stations. Your petitioners accordingly submit that requirement for additional works should be incorporated to the Bill, if enacted, including such road, railway and other construction works that may be deemed necessary to provide a Crossrail station at Woolwich.
- 17 Your petitioners have identified another location where the major servicing and maintenance depot for Crossrail trains may be located. This is the Eurostar depot at North Pole (Wormwood Scrubs) in West London from which the present operation should vacate from 2007 or 2008 on completion of the alternative facilities now under construction at Temple Mills. Your petitioner humbly submits that this existing depot facility along with the long established depot facilities at Ilford could be improved and modernised to accommodate and provide the necessary servicing of Crossrail trains at a considerably lower initial construction cost than that currently envisaged by the promoters, and thus minimizing the environmental impact and disturbance caused by the proposed works at Romford. Your petitioners object to the proposed works to construct a depot in Romford.
- 18 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 their member organisations, and other clauses and provisions necessary for their protection and benefit are omitted therefrom.

YOUR PETITIONERS 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, 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 amendments as may be necessary and proper for their protection and benefit.

AND YOUR PETITIONERS will ever pray, &c.