

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 DOMAINE DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

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 clauses 45 to 59 of the Bill deal with miscellaneous and general provisions.
3. The works proposed to be authorised by the Bill in respect of the railway

and associated works are specified in Schedule 1 to the Bill. The scheduled works are defined in the Bill as the works described in Schedule 1 to the Bill which are works authorised to be constructed by the nominated undertaker.

4. Your petitioners are Domaine Developments Limited, a company incorporated under the Companies Acts. They own the development site described in paragraph 6 below.
5. The land which is in the ownership of your petitioners is in the London Borough of Hillingdon and includes the plots numbered 241, 243 and 245 shown on the deposited plans. It is therefore liable to compulsory acquisition under the Bill. Your petitioners intend to redevelop that land. The proposed development is described in paragraph 7 below and the development site includes the said plots. Some of the development site is owned by Network Rail Infrastructure Limited. Your petitioners object to the proposals in the Bill in so far as they affect your petitioners' interests, for the reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.
6. Your petitioners wish to express their general support for the Crossrail proposals. The proposals will undoubtedly have a beneficial effect on your petitioners' development ("the development") if implemented in such a manner as not to interfere with it.
7. The development proposed by your petitioners in this area is of mixed use, including residential units, an hotel and aparthotel, retail accommodation, exhibition and display space, health and fitness centre, landscaped public space, communal gardens and parking provision together with highway improvements and access ways (including improved access to the Hayes and Harlington railway station ("the station"))
8. The land on which the development is to take place is bounded along the southern side by the existing Great Western Railway, along the western side by the existing access to the station and, for the most part, by the Grand Union Canal to the north east.
9. It is proposed by the Bill to authorise the compulsory acquisition of the

said plots 241, 243 and 245 which are within the limits of land to be acquired or used. No indication is given in the Bill itself as to the purpose of the acquisition of Plots 241 and 243, which form part of the approach to Hayes and Harlington Station, but it is understood that they are required for the construction of a new station building and the provision of access for construction purposes and permanent access for operational purposes. In Schedule 6 to the Bill, it is indicated that the purpose for which plot 245 may be acquired or used is the provision of a working site. The said plots of land would form an important part of your petitioners' proposed development because buildings and access to the development are proposed in the area concerned. An access into the development and connecting to a new bridge (replacing an existing bridge) over the existing Great Western line would be constructed upon plots 241 and 243, together with improvements to the existing highway.

10. Your petitioners have been involved in negotiations with Cross London Rail Links and Network Rail about the proposals for the said plots and a substantial amount of agreement has been reached. To secure their position, it is imperative that your petitioners obtain an agreement from the promoters or an amendment to the Bill to the effect that the said plots 241, 243 and 245 which are required by your petitioners for their development will not be acquired compulsorily nor occupied either temporarily or permanently under any of the powers contained within the Bill.
11. Your petitioners also seek agreement from Cross London Rail Links and the Secretary of State that neither they nor the nominated undertaker will object to your petitioners' planning proposals if they are restricted to an agreed building line.
12. As part of any agreement of the sort mentioned above, your petitioners would be willing to grant rights of access over part of their land to the nominated undertaker for certain purposes connected with their railway undertaking and the construction of the new station to an agreed design.
13. Any agreement of the type mentioned above would need to be entered into at the same time as an agreement with Network Rail concerning a

number of matters, including alignment of the proposed development, access, servicing and detailed provisions about works to be carried out by your petitioners in relation to the station and the station access.

14. There are a number of other detailed issues relating to your petitioners' proposed development in respect of which they seek protection, including the environmental effects of the construction and operation of the proposed railway works on their development. Your petitioners seek protection from the promoters in respect of noise, dust, access, hours of working and other matters.
15. 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 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.

HOUSE OF COMMONS
SESSION 2005-06

CROSSRAIL

PETITION

of

Domaine Developments Limited

AGAINST,

BY COUNSEL, &c.