

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 MINNIE COCKELL

SHEWETH as follows:-

1. A Bill (hereinafter called "the Bill") has been introduced into and is now pending in your honourable House entitled "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 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 Petitioner is Minnie Cockell, of 46 Hunter Avenue, Shenfield, Brentwood, Essex, CM15 8PF . The property is a detached house that was built in 1955 and which she and her late husband , together with their daughter, occupied from 1957. Your Petitioner is now in sole ownership and occupation of the freehold property .
5. Your Petitioner's house faces onto the site of the proposed works at Shenfield station. According to the Environmental Statement deposited with the Bill, residents of Hunter Avenue will be significantly affected by noise and or visual impact, to the extent that some residents may be eligible for insulation or even rehousing. Your Petitioner will be so affected.
6. Objection is made to Clause 6 and Schedule 6, specifically to the acquisition of land in the Borough of Brentwood for the purposes of the works described in Schedule 6, page101, lines 25 to 35 of the Bill.
7. Your Petitioner and her rights interests and property will be injuriously affected by the proposals in the Bill to which your Petitioner objects, for the reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.
8. Your Petitioner respectfully questions the need for Crossrail in its currently proposed form as, for example, the link between Shenfield, and other nearby stations en-route to London, with Heathrow and Maidenhead would be a very slow journey for those wishing to travel to

those destinations. Therefore your Petitioner alternatively suggests that the new cross-London section could terminate, for its Eastern (Essex) extremity, at Stratford, thus linking with all existing Great Eastern services, the North London Line, the new Eurostar Station and two underground lines (Jubilee and Central) and the Docklands Light Railway. This would provide the new cross-London route that is considered necessary, provide numerous connections, and avoid the need for expensive and environmentally unfriendly alterations at all existing stations between Stratford and Shenfield. Your Petitioner envisages that there would be adequate brown field land available for any associated facilities at or near to Stratford.

9. If it is deemed essential that trains using the new cross-London link should continue their journeys to points remote from London, your Petitioner humbly suggests that a better proposition, in respect of Essex, would be for the new service to be formed by fast trains coming from either Southend or points North-East of Chelmsford, such as Ipswich. In this case there would be no need for platform extensions as the stations at which these trains stop already have long platforms. No additional platform or sidings would be needed at Shenfield thus reducing the impact on the environment. Those joining existing "all stations" trains between Shenfield and London could change onto the new cross-London trains at Stratford or Liverpool Street.
10. In the unfortunate event that the existing proposals are adopted, your Petitioner would respectfully point out that her house is located on a road which will, according to the environmental statement deposited with the Bill, be used as a route for construction vehicles coming to and from the work sites at Shenfield Station and your Petitioner will therefore be affected by increased noise and traffic congestion outside her house.
11. Your Petitioner, a non-driver, is aged 86 but, nevertheless, is currently able to walk to the shops at Shenfield. She is concerned that additional traffic movements, debris deposited by works traffic and other

impediments introduced in connection with the proposed works, will make it difficult or impossible for her to continue undertaking her own shopping and visiting friends and neighbours elsewhere in the vicinity.

12. Your Petitioner is concerned about the proposed works adjacent to, and upon, the embankment which runs along the boundary of the Hunter Avenue car parks. It would appear that it is intended to form a temporary access road from the car park leading up the existing embankment to rail level. There are currently mature trees and other vegetation which form a partial barrier between the railway and housing, and it would seem likely that the mature trees will be removed to facilitate the access road to the detriment of future sound deadening and visual amenity. Indeed, it would seem that the intention is to widen the embankment by building a retaining wall, so that the opportunity to retain vegetation and mature trees, or to plant new trees, will be severely curtailed. Therefore, your Petitioner would respectfully suggest that the sidings proposed in this location should be moved either to White Gates, a small industrial area situated in the "V" formed by the divergence of the Southend and Chelmsford railway routes, where land infill would have to take place, or to another country location away from housing.
13. Bearing in mind the points made under paragraphs 10, 11 and 12 above, your Petitioner objects to Clause 3 and Schedule 3 of the Bill, specifically to the inclusion of roads in the Borough of Brentwood shown in Schedule 3 on page 75, lines 6 to 9.
14. Your Petitioner believes that if Crossrail progresses as currently proposed, there will be an adverse effect upon the value of many houses, including her own. Therefore, if not already catered for, she humbly requests that the Bill is amended so that compensation will become payable commensurate with any loss of value suffered.
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 PETITIONER[S] THEREFORE

HUMBLY PRAY

your Honourable House that the Bill may not pass into law as it now stands and that she be heard by herself, her 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 Petitioner and in support of such other clauses and amendments as may be necessary and proper for her protection and benefit.

AND YOUR PETITIONERS will ever pray, &c.