



IN PARLIAMENT  
HOUSE OF COMMONS  
SESSION 2005-06  
CROSSRAIL BILL

PETITION

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 Ms Annetta Pedretti

SHEWETH as follows:

1. A Bill (hereinafter referred to as 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 Country 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 promoted by the Secretary of State for Transport (hereinafter called the Promoter).

*Relevant clauses of the Bill*

3. Clauses 1 to 20 of the Bill with Schedules 1 to 9 make provision for the construction and maintenance of the proposed works including the main works set out in Schedule 1. Provision is included to confer powers for various building and engineering operations, for compulsory acquisition and the temporary use of and entry upon land, for the grant of planning permission and other consents, for the disapplication or modification of heritage and other controls and to govern interference with trees and the regulation of noise.
4. Clauses 21 to 44 of the Bill together with Schedule 10 make provision for the application with modifications and the disapplication in part of the existing railways regulatory regime which is contained in and in arrangements made under the Railways Act 1993 and associated legislation. In particular, they provide for the disapplication of licensing requirements, the imposition of special duties on the Office of the Rail Regulator (ORR), the modification of railway access contract and franchising arrangements and the disapplication of railway closure requirements and of the need for consent from Transport for London in relation to impacts on key system assets. Provision is also included to enable agreements to be required as between the nominated

undertaker and controllers of railway assets, to govern the basis for arbitration and to provide for the transfer of statutory powers in relation to railway assets.

5. Clauses 45 to 59 of the Bill together with Schedules 11 to 14 contain miscellaneous and general provisions. These include provision for the making of transfer schemes, the designation of nominated undertakers, the devolution of functions and as respects other actions to be taken by the Secretary of State. Provision is also made in particular for the disapplication or modification of various additional miscellaneous controls, for the treatment of burial grounds, for the application of provisions of the Bill to future extensions of Crossrail, for the particular protection of certain specified interests [(including your Petitioners)] and as respects arbitration.

*Your Petitioner and her property*

6. Your Petitioner is Ms Annetta Pedretti. Your Petitioner is a resident of a property that will be directly affected by the implementation of the Crossrail Bill.
7. Your Petitioner owns 25 Princelet Street, London E1 6QH (the Property) the subsoil of which is subject to the compulsory purchase proposals of the Bill. The Property is in the immediate vicinity of the proposed works and liable to be injuriously affected by them.
8. Your Petitioner and her rights, interests and property are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for the reasons amongst others, here stated.

*Your petitioner's concerns*

9. Your petitioner has many substantial concerns in respect of the provisions of the Bill as affecting the Property and her interest in it. Your Petitioner is greatly concerned by the overall impact which the project will have, and has already had, on her and her neighbours' health and quality of life, on her area and community and on her city as well as on the structural integrity and value of her property.
10. Your petitioner is concerned that the methods and route proposed by Crossrail will damage her property. In particular the tight curve in the track leading from Liverpool Street to the Hanbury Street tunnelling shaft, which would lie directly beneath her unique early 18th century Grade II Listed Building.
11. Your petitioner has a fundamental concern that the chosen route and methodology proposed in the Bill are undefined and unproven and that the provisions made for avoidance of damage are not adequate.
12. Your petitioner is concerned that with the lack of clarity and quality in the design the Bill is premature and would give an unspecified undertaker excessive powers to muddle along at great public expense and at the expense of injury to her property and rights and to the properties and rights of thousands of people in her community and area, as well as inflicting the inadequacies of the premature design on our city.

13. Your petitioner is concerned that without all the finance in place the Bill is premature and if passed would continue to inflict unacceptable and unjustifiable blight on her area, her community and her property.

*The proposed design and the petitioner's property*

14. Your petitioner's property lies directly above a change of direction on a tight curve proposed in the outline design for a railway tunnel between Liverpool Street and Whitechapel.
15. Your petitioner is concerned that this proposed curve puts at risk her unique Grade 2 listed building built by John Truman in 1705. Yet this building stands—and for three hundred years has stood—on no conceivable direct line between Liverpool Street and Whitechapel, on no conceivable direct line between Liverpool Street and Stratford and on no conceivable direct line between Liverpool Street and the Isle of Dogs.
16. Your petitioner alleges and is prepared to show that the need for this permanent curve in the proposed railway tunnel—which would have to be negotiated by 24 trains per hour forcing them to slow down and risking unnecessarily vibrating her building—remains entirely unproven.
17. Your petitioner humbly submits that the curve is ill-considered and that it would be premature and counter-productive to provide an unspecified undertaker with powers to carry out works to put in place this unproven curve in the tunnel directly to the east of Liverpool Street.

*A sketch design...not ready for implementation*

18. Your petitioner is concerned, and is prepared to show, that the detail of the works to be enabled by the Bill has not been considered and corresponds to the level of detail of an unresolved preliminary sketch design. This lack in the design of the works directly affects her property and the quiet enjoyment of her property.
19. Your petitioner is concerned that prematurely rendered in a CAD-enabled sales presentation this sketch design has only the superficial appearance of a definite resolution and that as such it should not be allowed to form the basis of the legal detail of the powers conferred by the Bill. Whilst excessive powers are sought to cover the missing clarity of the design, the premature rendering of the sketch design in legally binding terms, would actually restrict and prevent the further necessary design resolution!
20. Your petitioner is concerned that as it is Crossrail exists in a virtual reality bubble which would burst into a mass of unresolved issues on an excessive number of sites right across the capital that will sap the public purse and disrupt a great deal more than our Olympic responsibilities.

21. To prevent this your petitioner would suggest that the scheme be extracted from its murky background and subjected to the rigorous scrutiny of an independent, internationally informed and interdisciplinary design process and the proper scrutiny in a properly public forum, with a view to developing a clear and sustainable design brief and proper and socially responsible design guidelines.

*Use of inflationary powers*

22. Your petitioner is concerned that the very lack of resolution has been used to justify the powers to be secured by the Bill to extend over more and more land. Thus, your petitioner notes for example that the width of the strip of land apparently required to accommodate the two Crossrail tunnels appears to have increased by a factor of 1.44 over a period of 10 years. Where the resulting strip is now in the region of 50 meters wide the increase alone is a considerable 15 meters wide—wide enough...

*...to wipe Princelet Street off the map?*

23. Where the resulting Crossrail strip is in the region of 40 meters wide as in the curve under and behind your petitioners property, the increase alone is over 12 meters which is more than twice the depth of your petitioner's Grade 2 Listed building. In other words the mysterious process whereby this projected railway requires more land the longer it fails to be built is such that over ten years it has grown wider by enough to gobble up the entire terrace of Grade 2 listed buildings and to leave your petitioner and her property in a limbo of wasting years suspended in a bubble of Crossrail's virtual unreality...

*A sketch design that lacks dimensional integrity and is out of proportion*

24. Your petitioner is concerned that this indeterminacy undermines the confidence one would expect to bring to the dimensional integrity of a major scheme such as Crossrail. Under the circumstances one would be inclined to trust one's initial sense that there is something wrong with a proposed railway that is out of proportion with everything on the Ordnance Survey and neither looks like nor connects to any existing railway lines on that map. It may even be possible that in their virtual reality Crossrail tunnels & stations have somehow ended up being drawn out of scale.

*A sketch design that has lost its way*

25. Your petitioner is concerned that the sketch design reflects Crossrail's long history of ad-hoc responses to any unresolved issues arising. It bears all the hallmarks of a hodge-podge of accommodations pandering to the pet interests of the more-or-less incidental stakeholders consulted. Any sense of clarity of its remit—to provide a railway link—has been lost and, for instance, confused with its expected ability to clear—by means of this Bill—as much ground as possible for redevelopment (be it called "regeneration" or "over-site developments").

*Stretching CP powers for regeneration and oversight developments*

26. Your petitioner is concerned that with regard to her area in particular, so much talk of regeneration has been bounded about that no site—and none of the plots affected by the Bill in Tower Hamlets—can be assumed not to have been eyed, earmarked and chosen for 'regeneration' in connection with Crossrail, rather than—and often at odds with—the real requirements for building a good and proper railway.
27. Your petitioner submits that it needs to be made absolutely clear—in a brief for taking the present sketch design back to the drawing board—that the sole purpose of this Bill is to build a railway and that no land or subsoil or worksite or area may be subjected to blight, or safeguarded, or purchased or cleared for the stated or unstated direct or indirect purpose of an alleged 'regeneration' of an area.

*Whitechapel Station*

28. It is no secret that Whitechapel Station was added to the scheme at the insistence of our local council to "put the area on the map" for alleged 'regeneration' benefits! Whatever these may have been it is clearly not in the best interest of an effective rail link to force every passenger on every train to lose precious minutes stopping and starting for the benefit of 'regenerating' Whitechapel!
29. Instead, what has been put on the map is a Crossrail station with 'regeneration' ambitions of its own. Drawn to scale on the OS map Crossrail proposals are entirely out of proportion: ticketing halls and even ventilation shafts & escape provisions dwarf entire wings of the good hospital opposite! The "Extent of Land to be Acquired or Used" is such that it would effectively strangle the school, the tube station and every building on the block with blight and dust for long enough to clear more land for redevelopment.
30. Your petitioner notes that in this virtual bubble of Cross-regeneration, the inflationary growth on the ticketing hall has accelerated to reach a factor of 2.25 in just 6 months (since the Bill has been submitted to Parliament)—to gobble up an entire block and half the square and the bus terminal at Durward St!

*The Hanbury Street—via Pedley Street—to Mile End Park tunnelling worksite*

31. Your petitioner humbly submits that the case for the extent & route of the tunnels under the borough of Tower Hamlets has not been proven in terms purely of railway requirements. Your petitioner notes that whilst replicating major existing and part disused railway arteries, almost half the length of the entire Crossrail tunnel is projected to run—unproven & unnecessarily—under precious Tower Hamlets communities, disrupting virtually every precious amenity with worksites and permanent ventilation shafts—at an unacceptable cost to the communities of the borough.

32. Your petitioner objects to the socially irresponsible outrage of even contemplating digging from the Brick Lane area (whilst going to great length to pretend it is only a shaft mitigated by a more-or-less acceptable - lucrative! – over-site development!) which our council should have rejected out of hand as entirely unacceptable. Instead, the negotiations between CLRL Ltd. and Tower Hamlets council over the last three years amount to the total dereliction of duties and to an undemocratic and callous blow to the community of which your petitioner is part.

*Context sensitive design e.g. Noise, Vibration, & Dust Particles*

33. Your petitioner is concerned that the level of consideration in the present sketch scheme argues on grounds of health & safety for the railway to justify a 'ventilation shaft' at Hanbury Street. It does not address or consider the effect of adding more noise, vibration and dust particles to existing levels that may already be near or over acceptable levels. Design guidelines for Crossrail to go anywhere near communities must be context sensitive with regard to environmental impacts.

34. Your petitioner is concerned that what may appear reasonable levels to add to, or reasonable working hours anywhere else would prove unacceptable in an area where business hours run late into the night, with the entire area brimming with business on Sundays. Any project that intends to inflict more noise, vibration, and dust on this area would need to be prepared to address and find ways to reduce existing levels; put in place an effective, pre-emptive and no non-sense mechanisms for promptly removing and preventing nuisance; and clearly define, advertise and strictly enforce minimal quiet times in the early mornings and on the traditionally quiet Saturdays (which makes the Sunday markets and the many new Sunday festivals possible).

*Heritage and descriptive blight*

35. Your petitioner is concerned that unlike the earlier scheme which carefully avoided most of the Fournier Street Conservation Area the present sketch design appears to have been drawn up on the assumption that it is acceptable and expedient to tunnel under any number of Listed Buildings. Far from avoiding the Conservation Area, the present sketch design makes a b-line for the very core of the original Fournier Street Outstanding Conservation Area and goes out of its way to tunnel under three (Princelet St, Hanbury St and Wilkes St) of the four main streets of this CA—to seek powers of disapplication of controls in Schedule 8 with regard to no less than 47 unique Grade 2 Listed in these two blocks alone!

36. Your petitioner objects to her own and to any Listed Building being put at risk by under tunnelling. This includes being put at risk by the misrepresentation of the nature and properties of these Listed Buildings which CLRL Ltd. have put about.

37. (It may help to note that even though your petitioner has spend most of her life working to carefully restore a listed building with DoE and later EH grants, your petitioner would suggest that the fact that buildings have been listed—and that society has decided to

preserve them—should be respected. This listing should be used to test, limit and prevent CLRL Ltd and any potential undertaker from exploiting the excessive powers sought by the Bill).

38. Your petitioner is concerned that her council has not found it necessary to discourage Crossrail from under-tunnelling any Listed Buildings, never mind such unique and precious Grade I Listed Buildings as Christopher Wren's Trinity Green. The design proposed by the Bill proposes to put this unique cloister of Captain's Almshouses at risk, subjecting it to the vibrations of every train accelerating out of a proposed Crossrail station near Whitechapel. With a further 179 (!) Grade 2 Listed Buildings in the borough of Tower Hamlets alone, the Bill could be interpreted as setting a precedent for treating Listed Buildings as potential brownfield sites—for lucrative over-site developments!
39. Your petitioner would humbly suggest that the absolute need to go anywhere near a listed building would need to be proven in purely transport terms — and that any possible risks would need to be removed, for example by carefully underpinning the entire building prior to tunnelling under it.
40. Your petitioner humbly submits that unless the Promoter wishes to disinherit London of her Heritage, lose her the tourist industry and reduce this great city to a strip of suburban railway stations sprawling with over-sized developments—the present sketch design should be returned to the drawing board with clear design guidelines to avoid Listed Buildings at all costs.
41. There are other clauses and provisions in the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand, will prejudicially affect your Petitioner and her rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioner.

### *Conclusion*

Your Petitioner submits that the Bill fails adequately to safeguard and protect the interests of your Petitioner and should not be allowed to pass into law without these issues being addressed.

**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 themselves, Counsel or Agents and with 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 other such 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.

**AND YOUR PETITIONERS WILL EVER PRAY, &c.**