

IN PARLIAMENT
HOUSE OF COMMONS
SESSION 2006-07

CROSSRAIL BILL

P E T I T I O N

Against the Additional Provision (No. 3) – 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:

FIONA ATKINS of 5 FOURNIER STREET LONDON

PAUL SHEARER of 15 FOURNIER STREET LONDON

MARIANNA KENNEDY of 3 FOURNIER STREET LONDON

CHARLES GLEDHILL of 3 FOURNIER STREET LONDON

TRACEY EMIN OF 19 FOURNIER STREET

RODNEY ARCHER of 31 FOURNIER STREET LONDON

FRANK PICKARD of 23 FOURNIER STREET LONDON

REVEREND ANDY RIDER of 2 FOURNIER STREET LONDON

CHRISTOPHER LEGG of 4 FOURNIER STREET LONDON

ELEANOR JONES of 4 FOURNIER STREET LONDON

DENNIS ALFRED ESQULANT of 110 COMMERCIAL STREET LONDON

SANDRA ESQULANT of THE GOLDEN HEART 110 COMMERCIAL STREET LONDON

GILLIAN AULD of 12 PRINCELET STREET LONDON

JULIA STEGEMANN of 7 PUMA COURT LONDON

GREG CRIPPS of 7 PUMA COURT LONDON

DIANA REYNELL of 1 WILKES STREET AND 13 FOURNIER STREET LONDON

CHRISTOPHER MASSIP of APARTMENT 11, 8 PRINCELET STREET LONDON

RICCARDO BORSI of 23 PRINCELET STREET LONDON

HEATHER PETERSON of 23 PRINCELET STREET LONDON

RINA KARIN of 13 PUMA COURT LONDON

GRAHAM HICKLIN of 2 NORTON FOLGATE HOUSE PUMA COURT LONDON

ADELITA HICKLIN of 2 NORTON FOLGATE HOUSE PUMA COURT LONDON

SIMON DAVID of 3 NORTON FOLGATE ALMSHOUSE PUMA COURT LONDON

MICHAEL PICKLES of 5 NORTON FOLGATE ALMSHOUSE PUMA COURT LONDON

OXANA BRUCE of 8 NORTON FOLGATE ALMSHOUSE PUMA COURT LONDON

MEGAN WILLIAMS of FLAT 2 73 BRICK LANE LONDON

ROBERTO MASSARI of FLAT 2 73 BRICK LANE LONDON

CLIVE MURPHY of FIRST FLOOR FLAT 132 BRICK LANE LONDON

ALEXANDER PHILIP VRACAS of 34 HANBURY STREET LONDON

VIKKI LYSONS of 11 ½ FOURNIER STREET LONDON

MATTHEW PIPER of 11 ½ FOURNIER STREET LONDON

JULIA ANDERHEIM of 8 WILKES STREET LONDON

JOSHUA GOH of 8 WILKES STREET LONDON
MICHAEL LANDY of 8A WILKES STREET LONDON
GILLIAN WEARING OF 8a WILKES STREET LONDON
ADRIANA PAICE of 10 WILKES STREET LONDON
HARRIET LOGAN of 12 WILKES STREET LONDON
ANDREW HILLS of 12 WILKES STREET LONDON
JANE CURTIS of 16 WILKES STREET LONDON
KEITH BOWLER of 16 WILKES STREET LONDON
SIMON JOSEBURY of 3 WILKES STREET LONDON
SHEILA LAWSON of 3 WILKES STREET LONDON
MARK C FAULKNER of 9-11 WILKES STREET LONDON
ANGELA HARTNETT of 15 WILKES STREET LONDON
ANNE HARTNETT of 15 WILKES STREET LONDON
STUART BRISLEY of 17 WILKES STREET LONDON
MAYA BRISLEY of 17 WILKES STREET LONDON
JULIET MCKOEN of 23 WILKES STREET LONDON
SUE ROWLANDS of 25 WILKES STREET LONDON
ARFUEL NESSA of 10 PUMA COURT LONDON
JARVIZ KAHN of NORTON FOLGATE ALMSHOUSE 3 PUMA COURT
LONDON
FAY BRIDGET CATTINI of 32 MONTHOPE ROAD LONDON
NUNU BARS LIMITED of THE TENS BELLS COMMERCIAL STREET
LONDON
CHANNEL EAST LIMITED of 14 FOURNIER STREET LIMITED

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 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 (hereinafter called “the Promoter”).

3 On 7 November 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 November 2006” (hereinafter referred to as “the Additional Provision (No. 3)”).

4 Your Petitioners deposited a petition against the Bill in September 2005 (number 46). Your Petitioners and their rights, interests and property and those of their young families are injuriously affected by the Additional Provision (No. 3), to which your Petitioners object for reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

Your Petitioners’ further concerns

5 Your Petitioners welcome the changes to tunnelling strategy and the associated reduction in environmental impact within the immediate vicinity and the London Borough of Tower Hamlets as a whole. However, your Petitioners’ view is that, as the Promoters preferred choice of route for Crossrail was governed in part by the original tunnelling strategy, the change in the tunnelling strategy places a duty on the Promoter to reconsider the current Crossrail route as promoted in the Bill Your Petitioners require an undertaking that the Promoter will provide a full reassessment of the possible routes and shaft site given that there is now no need for tunnelling intervention and spoil removal

6 Your Petitioners believe that the choice of route gave undue consideration to the Promoter’s commercial interests and as such unduly interferes with private property rights Your Petitioners require an undertaking that the Promoter will

reassess the route and location of the shaft on the correct criteria applicable to rail construction

- 7 Your Petitioners' view is that the choice of the Hanbury Street over other alternative sites as the site for the intervention shaft is wrong and that the alternative sites for the intervention shaft were not properly considered. Your Petitioners' view is that although the change in tunnelling strategy will reduce the environmental impact in the immediate vicinity, the Promoter should seek to remove the environmental impact of what is still a huge shaft site (and therefore construction site) in a densely populated residential area with overwhelming existing health problems. In particular, your Petitioners' view is that the information provided to date to justify the choice of Hanbury Street was insufficient to discharge the Promoters duty to inform and consult with those people who live and work in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets. Your Petitioners remain unconvinced by the limited information so far provided to them.
- 8 Your Petitioners require the Promoter to provide a more detailed and comprehensive assessment of the Hanbury Street site as opposed to the Woodseer Street site and an assessment of sites along the so called southern route and a justification for why this location was chosen as the site for the intervention shaft. Your Petitioners consider that a full assessment of the environmental health and other effects on both the Hanbury and Woodseer sites and sites along the southern route should have been carried out. Without such evidence it is your Petitioners' view that no objective or fair decision could be properly made by the Promoter. Your Petitioners request an undertaking that the Promoter will carry out detailed assessments on these issues
- 9 Your Petitioners request full and detailed reports on settlement and vibration impact after having carried out full geological assessment and internal inspections of the buildings in the vicinity. Your Petitioners believe that the very limited reports carried out by the Promoter are insufficient for the impact to be assessed and that the failure to do so is insufficient to discharge the Promotor's duties to inform and consult with your Petitioners and disproportionately interferes with

their property rights. Your Petitioners request an undertaking that there will be no damage caused to their property by settlement vibration or otherwise arising out of the works or their subsequent operation, and no noise caused by the works or their subsequent operation and that if any damage or noise is caused it is made good to a standard appropriate to the age and character of the building at the entire expense of the Promoter and to the satisfaction of your Petitioners

- 10 Your Petitioners require notice of all undertakings given by the Promoter and an undertaking that the Promoter will “build on the CTRL experience”

General matters

- 11 As a general matter, your Petitioners submit that provision should be made for the Promoter to repay to your Petitioners all proper costs, charges and expenses (including the proper fees of such professional advisers as they may instruct) reasonably incurred in consequence of the Bill or of any provision made as a result of this Petition.

- 12 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

Conclusion

- 11 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

- 12 Your Petitioners therefore respectfully submit that insofar as it relates to the matters mentioned the Additional Provision (No. 3) 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 be allowed to pass into law as it now stands or as is now proposed and that they may be heard by themselves, their Counsel, Agents and witnesses in support of the allegations of this Petition against so much of the Additional Provision (No. 3) 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.