

IN PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SESSION 2005-06

CROSSRAIL

PETITION

Against the Additional Provision – 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 THE MAYOR AND
COMMONALTY AND CITIZENS OF THE CITY OF LONDON
ACTING BY THE COMMON COUNCIL

SHEWETH as follows: -

1. A Bill (referred to in this petition as “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. The Bill is promoted by the Secretary of State for Transport (in this petition called “the Promoter”).
3. On 9 May 2006 the Promoter deposited certain amendments to the Bill, together with an additional Environmental Statement, revised plans and sections and a

supplementary Book of Reference, collectively entitled “Amendment of Provisions May 2006” (referred to in this petition as “the Additional Provisions”).

4. Your petitioners deposited a petition against the Bill in September 2005 (number 26). Your petitioners and their rights and interests and property are injuriously affected by the Additional Provision, to which your petitioners object for reasons amongst others, as set out below.

Your petitioners' further concerns

Barbican Cross-over Cavern

5. The Additional Provisions provide for a new cross over cavern underneath the Barbican Estate further to the east and constructed by a different method from the cavern originally envisaged by the Bill as deposited. While your petitioners welcome the eastward move of the cavern and the alternative engineering approach implicit in the new proposal your petitioners remain concerned that the proposed works will cause settlement and damage to the Grade II listed Barbican Estate unless appropriate mitigation measures are applied. Your petitioners have particular concerns about Willoughby House, Brandon Mews, the Arts and Conference Centre, the Guildhall School of Music and Drama and the lake area. Your petitioners believe that there is a risk of distortions of concrete frames and damage to hard landscaping works, lakes and associated features which could be detrimental to lessees and other occupiers of the properties already mentioned.
6. Your petitioners are concerned that the Additional Environmental Statement of May 2006 envisages that the works to construct the cavern will require the lake to be drained. They question whether this is necessary and submit that if the lake is drained the nominated undertaker should be required to reinstate and restock the lake to your petitioners' satisfaction, immediately following completion of the relevant phase of the works.
7. Your petitioners submit that the nominated undertaker should be required to agree with your petitioners the detailed engineering approach to be used for the construction of the cavern. Further your petitioners assert that their agreement should be secured for all investigatory work, means of access to all works and also as to the extent,

nature, methodology and timing of any compensation grouting, underpinning or strengthening or other mitigation measures proposed for the Barbican Estate.

8. Further your petitioners submit that the nominated undertaker should be required to consult regularly with the residents of the properties on the estate and give the residents at least three weeks' notice of the commencement of the works beneath the estate.
9. Your petitioners continue to be concerned about the impact of the noise and vibrations from the construction works and the running railway on the Barbican Estate and in particular the Concert Hall and other facilities of the Barbican Centre and also, following the relocation of the cavern, on the Guildhall School of Music and Drama and its noise sensitive facilities.
10. Your petitioners submit that the nominated undertaker should be required to agree with them the engineering solutions to be implemented to reduce noise and vibrations from the railway as it passes underneath the Barbican Estate. Further, your petitioners ask that they be held indemnified by the nominated undertaker if the agreed engineering solutions are not sufficient to maintain the quality of the acoustics of the Barbican Concert Hall and your petitioners either incur expenditure through the need to undertake remedial work or suffer loss because it is not practicable to reinstate the sound quality of the Hall.

Moor Lane work site

11. The Additional Environmental Statement of May 2006 contains no assessment of the impact of the noise and dust from the proposed Moor Lane work site on the adjacent residential properties in the Barbican Estate. Your petitioners do not object to the location of the work site nor to the work that it is proposed should be undertaken there but submit that for the protection of the adjacent residents, the nominated undertaker should be required to eliminate the effect of noise and dust emitted by the work site by enclosing the site in an acoustic tunnel.
12. Further your petitioners submit that current protected residential nature of the location should be reflected by work being permitted at the site only on Mondays to Fridays 8am to 6pm and Saturdays 9am to 2pm.

Moorgate sewer diversion

13. Your petitioners are concerned that the proposed diversion works for the Moorgate sewer may disturb the ruins of the Roman City Wall, a scheduled monument of national importance, and other archeologically remains in that area. Your petitioners submit that the routeing of the diversion should be such as to minimise or eliminate any such impact.
14. There are other clauses and provisions in the Bill which, if passed into law as they are now proposed, will prejudicially affect your petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your petitioners.
15. Your petitioners submit that, in the respects mentioned and in other respects, the Bill fails adequately to safeguard and protect the interests of your petitioners.
16. Your petitioners therefore respectfully submit that insofar as it relates to the matters mentioned the Additional Provision should not be inserted in the Bill and the Bill should not be allowed to pass into law in its proposed form.

YOUR PETITIONERS therefore humbly pray your Honourable House that the Bill may not pass into law as it now stands, and that they may be heard by themselves, their counsel or agents and witnesses in support of the allegations of this petition, against so much of the Additional Provision as affects their property rights and interests, and in support of such other clauses and amendments as may be necessary and proper for their protection and benefit, and that they may have such other relief in the premises as your Honourable House shall deem meet.

AND ~~your~~ petitioners will ever pray, &c



Paul R.E. Double

Agent for the Mayor and
Commonalty and Citizens of the
City of London acting by the
Common Council.
9th June 2006