



House of Commons  
Select Committee on the  
Crossrail Bill

---

**Crossrail Bill**

---

**First Special Report of Session  
2006–07**

***Volume I***

*Report, together with formal minutes*

*Ordered by The House of Commons  
to be printed 18 October 2007*

**HC 235-I**

Published on 23 October 2007  
by authority of the House of Commons  
London: The Stationery Office Limited  
£0.00

## The Select Committee on the Crossrail Bill

The Select Committee on the Crossrail Bill is appointed by the House of Commons to consider:

(a) any Petition against the Bill presented by being deposited in the Private Bill Office at any time not later than 16th September 2005, and

(b) any Petition which has been presented by being deposited in the Private Bill Office and in which the Petitioners complain of any amendment as proposed in the filled-up Bill or of any matter which has arisen during the progress of the Bill before the Select Committee, being a Petition in which the Petitioners pray to be heard by themselves, their Counsel or Agents.

That, notwithstanding the practice of the House that appearances on Petitions against an opposed Private Bill be required to be entered at the first meeting of the Select Committee on the Bill, in the case of any such Petitions as are mentioned in sub-paragraph (a) above on which appearances are not entered at that meeting, the Select Committee shall appoint a later day on which it will require appearances on those Petitions to be entered.

That any Petitioner whose Petition stands referred to the Select Committee shall, subject to the Rules and Orders of the House and to the Prayer of his Petition, be entitled to be heard by himself, his Counsel or Agents upon his Petition provided that it is prepared and signed in conformity with the Rules and Orders of the House, and the Member in charge of the Bill shall be entitled to be heard by his Counsel or Agents in favour of the Bill against that Petition.

That the Select Committee have power to sit notwithstanding any adjournment of the House, to adjourn from place to place and to report from day to day the Minutes of Evidence taken before it.

That three be the Quorum of the Select Committee.

### Current membership

Mr Alan Meale (*Labour, Mansfield*) (Chairman)  
Mr Brian Binley (*Conservative, Northampton South*)  
Ms Katy Clark (*Labour, North Ayrshire and Arran*)  
Mr Philip Hollobone (*Conservative, Kettering*)  
Kelvin Hopkins (*Labour, Luton North*)  
Mrs Siân C. James (*Labour, Swansea East*)  
Mr Ian Liddell-Grainger (*Conservative, Bridgwater*)  
John Pugh (*Liberal Democrats, Southport*)  
Mrs Linda Riordan (*Labour, Halifax*)  
Sir Peter Soulsby (*Labour, Leicester South*)

### Publications

The Reports and evidence of the Committee are published by The Stationery Office by Order of the House. All publications of the Committee are on the Internet at [www.parliament.uk/parliamentary\\_committees/crossrail.cfm](http://www.parliament.uk/parliamentary_committees/crossrail.cfm)

### **Committee staff**

The staff of the Committee are Sian Jones (Clerk) and Darren Hackett (Committee Assistant).

### **Contacts**

All correspondence should be addressed to Private Bill Office, House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA. The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 3250; the Committee's email address is [prbohoc@parliament.uk](mailto:prbohoc@parliament.uk)



# Contents

---

<b>Report</b>	<i>Page</i>
<b>Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
Crossrail	5
The Promoter and the history of the scheme	5
The Powers of the Bill	6
<b>2 The Select Committee on the Crossrail Bill</b>	<b>8</b>
Agreed by the House of Commons	8
A petition against a hybrid bill	8
Who petitioned?	8
Rights of Parties	9
Order of Proceedings	9
Rules observed in Committee	9
Making amendments to the Bill (Additional Provisions)	10
<b>3 Challenges faced by the Committee</b>	<b>11</b>
An unfamiliar process	11
Instructions given to the Committee	11
First Instruction	11
Second and Third Instructions	12
Fourth Instruction	12
Fifth Instruction	13
An Impartial Committee	13
<b>4 Specific local changes to the Bill and relevant undertakings</b>	<b>14</b>
Register of Undertakings and Assurances	14
Smithfield Market Tenants Association	14
Charterhouse Street	15
Christchurch, Spitalfields, and St Dunstan and All Saints Church, Stepney	15
Ealing Broadway	15
EMI Limited	15
Fairfield Conservation Area Residents Association	16
GE Pensions Limited	16
Great Western Allotment Association	17
London Borough of Havering	17
National Council of the Cycling Touring Club	18
Paddington Residents' Active Concern on Transport	18
The Congestion Zone	19
Shenfield	19
Southend Arterial Road Action Group	20
Barbara and Tony Wheeler and Emma Jeffery	20
Floating Slab Track	21

<b>5</b>	<b>Petitioners requiring significant protection</b>	<b>21</b>
	Areas of Soho Sound Mitigation: Grand Central Sound Studios	21
	Liverpool Street Station	22
	Spitalfields	24
	Local Monitoring Body	24
	One Stop Shop	24
	Schools in Spitalfields	25
	Health in Spitalfields	25
	Historic buildings in Spitalfields	26
	61 Princelet Street	27
	Old Oak Common Depot	27
	London Borough of Tower Hamlets	28
	Westbourne Park Villas Residents' Association	28
	Marriott Hotels and West India Quay Development Company (Eastern) Limited	28
	Canary Wharf Group PLC	29
	Trustees of the SS Robin Trust	29
	Residents of Poplar Dock	29
	Citipost AMP Limited and Mr Daniel Albert Charlesworth	30
<b>6</b>	<b>Groundborne Noise and Vibration</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Revised Tunnelling Strategy</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Woolwich Station</b>	<b>33</b>
	Issues relating to Woolwich station	33
<b>9</b>	<b>Freight</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>The Environmental Statements and the Environmental Impact Assessment</b>	<b>36</b>
	Issues raised in petitions relating to Environmental Impact	36
	Issues raised in petitions deposited against the third set of Additional Provisions relating to Environmental Impact	54
	Further issues	54
<b>11</b>	<b>Conclusion – the future of the project</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>Annex A: Instructions</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>13</b>	<b>Annex B: Committee Visits</b>	<b>63</b>
	<b>Formal minutes</b>	<b>67</b>
	<b>Petitioners against the Crossrail Bill</b>	<b>68</b>
	<b>List of unprinted evidence</b>	<b>79</b>
	<b>List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament</b>	<b>91</b>

## Summary

---

This Report explains the decisions and recommendations the Select Committee on the Crossrail Bill has made after sitting in public for 84 days of hearings and considering the cases presented on 205 of the 457 petitions deposited against the Crossrail Bill and against the 4 sets of additional provisions deposited by the Government. As a result of these considerations the Committee has made certain amendments to the Bill to meet or partially cover the requirements of Petitioners where we judged it appropriate. There were also a number of issues where the Committee made recommendations or suggested a course of action to the Promoter of the Bill instead of making an amendment to the Bill.

This Report details many, but not all of the cases presented in Committee. The Committee has only commented on cases where it deemed necessary. In all other cases, the Committee was satisfied with the undertakings and assurances offered by the Promoter to the Petitioner.



# 1 Introduction

---

## Crossrail

1. The Crossrail Bill provides 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’<sup>1</sup>. The said railway transport system is a proposal affecting primarily London and the South East of England. The intention is to deliver a railway with a frequent train service across the capital by 2017.<sup>2</sup> The route will begin in Maidenhead and Heathrow and travel via Paddington, Liverpool Street and Stratford to Shenfield, and via Whitechapel to Abbey Wood. The railway will travel underground through the city centre between Paddington and east London.

## The Promoter and the history of the scheme

2. The Department for Transport and Transport for London formed a 50/50 joint venture company, Cross London Rail Links (CLRL), to promote and develop the Crossrail scheme. The construction of a project, such as Crossrail, requires the authority of Parliament in the form of a Bill. The Crossrail Bill was presented by the Secretary of State for Transport on 18 May 2005. The Bill is hybrid because although promoted by the Secretary of State as a matter of public policy, it adversely affects the private interests of certain individuals and organisations, who may therefore be entitled to have their objections considered by a select committee under a quasi-judicial procedure akin to that for private bills. Objections are made by depositing a petition against the Bill.<sup>3</sup>

3. The proposals for such a transport scheme are not unique to this Bill. Parliament considered a Crossrail Bill over a decade ago. That Bill, promoted by Transport for London, was developed following the 1989 Central London Rail Study.<sup>4</sup> It was presented as a private Bill to the House of Commons on 22 January 1991. However, the Bill was blocked from proceeding at several of its Parliamentary stages. The 1991 Bill had 314 petitions deposited against it. At that time, an Opposed Bill Committee was formed to hear the cases for and against the Bill and it subsequently sat for 7 months. The Bill was finally rejected by the Committee on 11 May 1994. The Committee reported that the case for the bill had not been made. The Bill was therefore not passed by the House. However, the Government issued Safeguarding Directions to protect the alignments of the lines through central London, that ensured that no developments could be built which would prevent the Crossrail scheme from being built in the future. We note that the Safeguarding Directions had a long term impact on some of the landowners along the route.

---

1 Crossrail Bill [Bill 2(2006-07)]

2 Paragraph 21737 [Mr T Mould QC]

3 People affected by the Bill are entitled to object to it by depositing a Petition against the Bill. Petitions can be deposited in both the House of Commons and the House of Lords within a set timetable. Please see paragraph 13.

4 Department of Transport, 1989

4. In 2001, CLRL was allocated a budget of £154 million by central Government to carry out feasibility work connected to the possible acquisition of Parliamentary powers. It was given a further £100 million in 2005 for development work.<sup>5</sup> The Promoter of the Bill brought forward legislation to Parliament in May 2005 to enable the construction of the Crossrail transport system.<sup>6</sup>

## The Powers of the Bill

5. The Bill will confer a range of powers on the nominated undertaker<sup>7</sup> to build and operate Crossrail. These include the right to construct and maintain Crossrail and the other associated and enabling works.<sup>8</sup> These works are summarised in the Environmental Statement and the explanatory memorandum accompanying the Bill. A summary of the main powers sought in the legislation follows below:<sup>9</sup>

- a) The Bill will grant deemed planning permission for the construction of Crossrail and other associated and enabling works. The Bill will also remove the need for listed building consent under section 8 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- b) The Bill will provide for the demolition, alteration or extension of the listed buildings specified in the Bill where this is necessary to construct the scheme and it removes the need to obtain conservation area consent under section 74 of the 1990 Act, for the demolition of buildings and other structures specified in the Bill within designated conservation areas where this is necessary to construct Crossrail and the other associated and enabling works.
- c) The Bill will confer powers of compulsory acquisition or temporary possession of the land needed to construct Crossrail and it authorises the stopping up or closure of highways and other public thoroughfares both permanently and temporarily, and the alteration of highways.
- d) The legislation also gives the Promoter of the Bill the enabling rights to use certain rail facilities to be taken or varied for the purposes of providing Crossrail services<sup>10</sup>; it authorises interference with navigable waterways; and it confers other powers required in connection with the construction and operation of Crossrail and other associated and enabling works.

---

5 <http://www.crossrail.co.uk/pages/whatiscrossrail.html>

6 Votes and Proceedings: Wednesday 18 May 2005, p15

7 The 'nominated undertaker' is given powers in the Bill to implement the construction of the Crossrail project. The Bill gives the Secretary of State the ability to nominate that undertaker.

8 Associated and enabling works are those which do not directly relate to the construction of the railway but are needed to allow the construction work to take place.

9 Please refer to the Bill and its explanatory memorandum for a detailed explanation of the Bill's provisions. Explanatory notes to the Bill, prepared by the Department for Transport, Crossrail Bill [Bill 2 and 2—EN (2006-07)]

10 The Bill provides that in the period between Royal Assent and the start of Crossrail passenger services, the Office of Rail Regulation ('ORR') shall exercise its functions, so far as they relate to access contracts, in a manner so as to facilitate the operation of the principal Crossrail passenger service on and after a date specified by the Secretary of State.

e) There are provisions in the Bill that will deem planning permission to be granted for the authorised works, and such permission is deemed subject to conditions requiring the approval of the local planning authority for certain matters of detail. The extent of matters subject to approval under these conditions will depend upon whether the local planning authority is a 'qualifying authority', that is, it has given an undertaking to the Secretary of State about the way in which it will handle applications for approval of details. For qualifying authorities, the matters subject to approval will include certain construction arrangements. Where works affect highways, the Bill will also provide for certain matters to be subject to the approval of the relevant highway authority.<sup>11</sup>

6. In short, this legislation provides the legislative framework to allow the construction of Crossrail. It amends existing powers, where the Promoter deems necessary, to ensure the construction and operation of the proposed transport scheme.

---

11 <http://Billdocuments.crossrail.co.uk>

## 2 The Select Committee on the Crossrail Bill

---

7. Select Committees on hybrid bills do not operate under the same parliamentary rules as departmental select committees. They are quasi-judicial and operate more like a court. Committees, such as ours, do not have an extensive remit and serve only to consider the issues raised by Petitioners, where the Petitioner has *locus standi*<sup>12</sup>. In addition we were given five Instructions by the House of Commons that served further to define what issues we would be able to consider. One of the main causes of frustration for the Committee was that some Petitioners wished to raise issues which we were not empowered to consider.

8. We take this opportunity to summarise briefly the rules and procedure followed in Committee so that the House and members of the public can readily understand the limited framework in which the Committee was able to operate.

### Agreed by the House of Commons

9. A hybrid bill has a second reading in the House of Commons before it is referred to a Select Committee. Once the House agrees that the Bill should be read a second time, it is deemed to have approved it in principle. A Select Committee on a hybrid bill may not therefore reject the bill. Petitioners are subsequently limited in the arguments they promote in committee; they may seek to amend the Bill and may not argue that the Committee should reject it.

### A petition against a hybrid bill

10. A petition is a summary of objections to particular aspects of the Bill. It is a request to the House of Commons for the Petitioner to be allowed to argue their case before the Select Committee on the Crossrail Bill.

### Who petitioned?

11. The Crossrail Bill and the Environmental Statement were published on 22 February 2005.<sup>13</sup> The timetable for receiving petitions in the House of Commons was laid down in an Order of the House on 19 July 2005.<sup>14</sup> Any individual, group of individuals, or organisation ‘directly and specially affected’ by the provisions of the Crossrail Bill was able to petition against it.<sup>15</sup> Needless to say, there were a few cases where Petitioners tested the definition of ‘directly and specially’ to the limit. Some 358 petitions against the Bill were

---

12 The Promoter of the Bill may decide that, in their view, a Petitioner does not have a right, or *locus standi*, to petition against a Bill. Usually such a decision is taken because the Petitioner does not seem to be locally or specifically affected by the Bill, although other reasons may exist. If the *locus standi* of a Petitioner is objected to, it is decided upon by the Committee on whom the decisions of the Court of Referees are binding. (See Erskine May, *Parliamentary Practice*, Twenty-third edition, Chapter 39, LexisNexis Butterworths. )

13 Crossrail Bill [Bill 1 and 1—EN (2005-06)]

14 The Private Bill Office remained open throughout the Summer recess to allow Petitioners three months to prepare and deposit their petitions.

15 The House of Commons produced 5000 leaflets explaining to those affected how they could petition Parliament. The Promoter of the Bill kindly agreed to send a leaflet to every person who received notice from the Promoter that they were affected.

deposited (an additional 99 petitions were deposited against the four sets of Additional Provisions).<sup>16</sup>

12. Many Petitioners believed that the Crossrail Bill would have a direct or deleterious effect on their well-being, their property or their business. The Committee heard from many, but not all, of the Petitioners during its hearings. Some Petitioners chose not to appear and some withdrew their petitions after negotiating a satisfactory undertaking with the Promoter of the Bill. All hearings took place in public and were transcribed and web-cast.

## Rights of Parties

13. Both Promoter and Petitioners have the right to appear before the Committee to make their cases. The practice of the House allows Petitioners to be heard either in person, or by their agent or counsel. The Promoter of the Bill, the Secretary of State for Transport, was represented by his parliamentary agents, the firm of solicitors Winckworth Sherwood, and by legal Counsel. All petitions not withdrawn or successfully challenged on *locus standi* grounds, were referred to the Committee.

## Order of Proceedings

14. In a select committee on a hybrid bill, the onus is on the Petitioner, or their Agent<sup>17</sup>, to prove that they are unreasonably affected by the Bill. It is usual in these circumstances to allow the Petitioner both the first and last words on each case. However, we recognised that this practice often disadvantaged Petitioners, many of whom had not appeared before a parliamentary committee before, by requiring them to explain complicated technical matters. Therefore the Committee insisted that Counsel for the Promoter made a brief factual statement at the beginning of each case explaining what the issues of contention were between the two parties.

15. Thus, Counsel for the Promoter briefly opened each case and then the Petitioner had their opportunity to set out their concerns and objections. The Petitioner was able to call witnesses in support of their case. The witnesses could be cross-examined by the Counsel for the Promoter, and re-examined by the Petitioner.

16. Once the Petitioner's case had been made, the Counsel for the Promoter would open his case. Again, witnesses could be called, examined, cross-examined and re-examined. The Petitioner had a right of reply.

## Rules observed in Committee

17. In presenting their evidence to the Committee, Petitioners were restricted in a number of ways:

---

<sup>16</sup> Private Business Notice Paper Session 2005-06, pages: 37-50, 127-131, 135 and Session 2006-07 pages: 11,15-19,125-129. Contents of the petitions can be viewed at:  
<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/pabills/200607/crossrail.htm>

<sup>17</sup> Petitioners may chose to be represented by an Agent acting on their behalf or by legal Counsel.

- a) Petitioners could only be heard on matters included in their petitions, and were not able to make additional arguments before the Committee.
- b) Petitioners could only seek to represent themselves and those who had signed the petition. Any attempt to raise the concerns of neighbours or others who had not petitioned the Committee was not allowed. This was because the Committee could not reasonably determine why others had chosen not to petition. To allow Petitioners to argue on behalf of others would fall foul of the rules relating to *locus standi*.<sup>18</sup>
- c) Witnesses, Counsel and Petitioners were all obliged to conduct themselves before the Committee in a way which did not constitute a contempt of the House of Commons. Generally, that meant that all parties were obliged to be respectful.
- d) Repetitious and irrelevant evidence, deliberate delay, and refusal to answer questions were all treated as possible contempts of the House and were deprecated in Committee.

### **Making amendments to the Bill (Additional Provisions)**

18. After hearing all the evidence on a case the Committee would decide whether or not it should amend the Bill. There were usually two types of amendment the Committee could consider making to the Bill. These were amendments that would:

- a) naturally tend to limit the powers, or
- b) extend the obligations of the Government and extend the powers contained in the Bill.

19. The latter type of amendment is known as an Additional Provision. Since such an amendment could potentially have an impact on people not previously affected by the Bill, Additional Provisions need to be advertised and authorised by the House in the same way as the original provisions of the Bill.

20. On occasions where we agreed such amendments were necessary, these decisions were announced in Committee. This was to allow the Government to bring forward the necessary Additional Provisions to the Bill and also to give the public the opportunity to object to these provisions if they were affected by them.

21. Although Additional Provisions to the Crossrail Bill were put forward by the Secretary of State, they were not formally accepted as amendments to the Bill until the Committee had fully considered all the cases presented against them. All amendments we judged to be appropriate were made formally to the Bill when we reported the Bill to the House.

---

18 Locus standi: see footnote 8.

## 3 Challenges faced by the Committee

---

22. Having been appointed in December 2005, the Committee first met in public on 17 January 2006 to begin the task of hearing the case of each Petitioner. This task continued for 22 months, with the Committee being called to meet up to eight times each week. The Committee sat for 84 days in public meetings, heard 205 Petitioners (in total) and received 413 volumes of written evidence. Members of the Committee worked exceptionally hard to fit this demanding timetable into their other parliamentary duties.

23. At this point, the Committee wishes to place on record its sincere thanks to the staff in the House connected with the Bill who assisted Members, Petitioners and the Promoter during the lengthy committee stage. We much appreciated the help, advice and services, provided by the staff of Clerks, Serjeant at Arms and Refreshment Departments. We also wish to thank the security staff and the cleaners who all worked hard to help us in this important task.

### An unfamiliar process

24. Before we set out the significant issues that arose during the Committee's hearings we wish to make a few general points about the process itself. Firstly, the public has come to expect consultation documents from Government departments regarding new pieces of legislation. They are less familiar with the hybrid bill process. Many members of the public were sceptical that by depositing a petition they could have an opportunity to convince a parliamentary committee to change the Bill on their behalf. We trust that the extensive information and assistance provided to the public by the House and by the Government enabled all those who wished to engage in this process to do so.

25. We were also concerned that, as one might expect in the case of a Bill of this size, the only organisation placed to answer detailed public enquiries about the Bill was the company, Cross London Rail Links (the company formed to promote the Bill). In relation to certain cases put to us, we have highlighted our dissatisfaction at the lack of information given at times by the Promoter to the public during the consultation periods.<sup>19</sup>

### Instructions given to the Committee

26. The House of Commons agreed five Instructions to the Committee during the last 18 months. These instructions had a variety of purposes and are therefore included in full in the appendix to this Report.

### First Instruction

27. The first Instruction (agreed on 19 July 2005)<sup>20</sup> required us to report matters relating to the environmental impact of the railway to the House. It also served to set out what the Committee should consider to be part of the principle of the Bill. The practice of the House

---

19 Paragraph 10860 [Chairman]; Paragraph 10917 [Ms J Cove];

20 Votes and Proceedings, Tuesday 19 July 2005, p143

of Commons prevents a select committee on a hybrid bill from considering matters which affect the principle of the bill. The first Instruction thus further restricted the issues on which we could hear petitions. There was some confusion during the debate on the Instruction that unfortunately led some members of the public to petition against aspects of the Bill we had been instructed not to consider.

**28. It is our view that this Instruction, although intended to provide clarity to the Committee was essentially unhelpful and served to confuse and potentially disadvantage members of the public. We recommend that future hybrid bill committees be allowed to decide what constitutes the principle of the Bill without such an Instruction.**

## Second and Third Instructions

29. The first Instruction was later clarified by two further Instructions which were passed by the House of Commons on 12 January 2006.<sup>21</sup> The second Instruction allowed us to consider petitions on the first set of Additional Provisions that the Government introduced. The Additional Provisions changed the detail of the project and were a result of discussions with interested parties following the Bill's introduction in 2005.

30. The third Instruction allowed the Committee to consider certain issues raised by Petitioners which we would not otherwise have been able to consider, namely whether Crossrail should extend to Reading or Ebbsfleet. The location of the Crossrail termini identified in the Bill (Maidenhead in the West and Abbey Wood in the South East) had been specified under the first Instruction to be treated as part of the established principle of the Bill. The third Instruction was therefore necessary to enable the Committee to hear Petitioners on the issue of a possible extension of the line to Reading or Ebbsfleet.

31. It is important to note that the third Instruction did not allow us to consider the above issues with a view to amending the Bill. We were permitted to consider such issues for the purpose of reporting to the House of Commons whether there appeared to be a case for such an extension being the subject of an application for an Order under section 1 of the Transport and Works Act 1990. Any such Order would have to be taken forward independently of the Bill process.

## Fourth Instruction

32. The fourth Instruction, agreed on 31 October 2006, empowered the Committee to consider the Additional Provisions that were introduced to:

- a) reflect the Committee's interim conclusions announced in July 2006 and make changes to the project in light of Petitioners' concerns;
- b) allow development of the project in light of discussions with stakeholders;
- c) reduce the project cost; or

---

<sup>21</sup> Votes and Proceedings, Thursday 12 January 2006, p553

d) make minor technical changes.

### **Fifth Instruction**

33. The fifth and final Instruction was agreed on 25 April 2007 and was brought forward at the specific request of the Committee. Our interim conclusions of July 2006 covered a range of issues, which included accepting the case for constructing a station at Woolwich. We took the view that the Government, as the Promoter of the scheme, should bring forward an Additional Provision to add to the project a station at Woolwich. We address this matter in detail later in our Report but we note here that this Instruction was the result of months of repeated requests to the Secretary of State. This Instruction enabled the Committee to consider an Additional Provision for such a station.

### **An Impartial Committee**

34. Members of the Select Committee on the Crossrail Bill were selected because they did not have any local or personal interests in the Bill ensuring that they could judge impartially each case before them. The Committee ensured that all the information provided during Committee meetings was accessible to the public. We also insisted in committee that all legal Counsel and their experts explained the situation to us from first principles. We found that on several occasions, a Petitioner's original concerns dissipated when the issue was clarified by the relevant expert witness.

## 4 Specific local changes to the Bill and relevant undertakings

---

### Register of Undertakings and Assurances

35. Some Petitioners against the Crossrail Bill were offered assurances or undertakings by the Promoter either in the Committee hearings or during discussions. These undertakings set out what a Petitioner could expect from the Promoter. The Department for Transport have recently published the first draft of the Crossrail Undertakings and Assurances Register. The register is intended to capture all the individual undertakings and assurances given to Petitioners in a single document thus ensuring that the ‘nominated undertaker’ (the person who will in due course be appointed to construct Crossrail), as well as the Secretary of State for Transport or any other organisation exercising the Bill powers, complies with them. The Committee understands that the register will form part of the Crossrail Environmental Minimum Requirements (EMRs) and that an undertaking has been given that ‘any nominated undertaker will be contractually bound to comply with the controls set out in the EMRs’.<sup>22</sup> Therefore, we are reassured that the nominated undertaker will be contractually required to comply with the undertakings and assurances given by the Promoter in Committee and in private negotiation with Petitioners.

36. Many Petitioners were not clear which undertakings applied to their particular case. With this in mind, the Committee required the Promoter to write to every Petitioner whose property was affected on the route to state specifically which undertakings applied to their property and what level of comfort those undertakings would provide to the Petitioner. **Furthermore, we now expect the Promoter to ensure that all assurances and undertakings given to Petitioners are written in clear and direct terms. We are concerned that the draft Register of Undertakings and Assurances, published by the Department for Transport, is not user-friendly. The Crossrail Bill is a complicated piece of legislation. The public needs to have a clear understanding of the impact of the Bill, how each area will be affected by it and what action will be taken by the Promoter to mitigate any impact. We look to the Committee in the House of Lords to ensure that further clarity is achieved before the Bill reaches Royal Assent.**

### Smithfield Market Tenants Association

37. The members of the *Smithfield Market Tenants Association*, were the tenants and traders in the London Central Markets in the City of London, more commonly known as the Smithfield meat market. The tenants held business leases of their respective shops and offices from the City of London for terms, typically, of 10 years ending December 2009 but renewable under Part 2 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1954. The membership of the Association comprised all the active market traders bar one.

38. The Committee agreed that the *tenants of Smithfield Market* were not covered by the compensation provisions in an appropriate manner due to the exceptional and historic

---

<sup>22</sup> <http://Billdocuments.crossrail.co.uk/80256fa10055060f/pages/ofundertakingsandassurances>

nature of their business. The Committee invited the Promoter to draw up an alternative provision which would provide the tenants with the right to claim compensation in circumstances where a specific level of loss was experienced.

### **Charterhouse Street**

39. *SAVE Britain's Heritage* is a registered charity and a Petitioner against the Bill. It was founded to campaign publicly for the protection of threatened historic buildings and areas. Following the petition of *Save Britain's Heritage*, we asked the Promoter to explore and assess alternatives to the compulsory purchase of 33-37 Charterhouse Street. In response to our request, the Promoter commissioned an engineering study which showed that there were no suitable alternatives which would not have more significant effects on the area than the current Bill scheme. For this reason, we agreed that the Promoter should continue with the original proposal.

### **Christchurch, Spitalfields, and St Dunstan and All Saints Church, Stepney**

40. The *Christchurch, Spitalfields and, St Dunstan and All Saints, Stepney churches* were going to be affected by the Crossrail tunnelling works. There was considerable concern that the vibration from the Crossrail works could damage the structural stability of valuable community churches. It was also a concern that the noise of the tunnelling machine would interfere with the services and concerts held within these historic churches. The Committee was convinced that that these churches required the maximum level of noise and vibration mitigation and that they should not be expected to pay for the monitoring of any impact on the structures of the churches due to the tunnelling work. We expected the Promoter to pay for independent assessment and monitoring of both these churches during the works. We were pleased with the undertakings given by the Promoter to these churches in response to our concerns.

### **Ealing Broadway**

41. Ealing Broadway is a National Rail and London Underground station in Ealing in west London. National Rail services are provided by First Great Western and Heathrow Connect and London Underground services are provided by the District and Central Lines. The Committee was concerned about the interaction of the Crossrail project with the existing services and asked the Promoter to demonstrate that a good cross-platform interchange could be made available at Ealing Broadway between the Reading and Crossrail lines. The Committee was pleased that the Promoter agreed that 'same platform' interchange would be possible at Ealing Broadway.

### **EMI Limited**

42. The *EMI Group* is a major British record company. EMI Music operates several labels, based in Kensington in London, England, United Kingdom. We were told that *EMI* owned two premises 12 Goslett Yard and parts of 127 Charing Cross Road, that would be affected by the Crossrail Bill. Goslett Yard was to be acquired and demolished for the Eastern Ticket Hall of the proposed Tottenham Court Road Station. 127 Charing Cross Road would be above and adjacent to the proposed ticket hall and the westbound platform

tunnel at the proposed Tottenham Court Road Station. The Committee heard that at the time of the announcement of Crossrail, *EMI* was in the commencement of major refurbishment of its offices and studios at 12 Goslett Road, which housed recording studios that were acoustically sensitive.<sup>23</sup>

43. The Committee listened carefully to the case of *EMI*. We noted that the scheduled refurbishment of the *EMI* building would increase the value of the property and that this increased value would have to be built into any compulsory purchase order negotiation. Therefore, in order to keep the cost to the public purse as low as possible, we insisted that the Petitioners should be subject to a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) as soon as practicable after Royal Assent.

44. The Promoter agreed to offer *EMI* an undertaking to purchase their building at a time of *EMI*'s choosing from the date of Royal Assent.

### Fairfield Conservation Area Residents Association

45. The *Association* appeared before the Committee in October 2006 because they were concerned about the impact of Crossrail on Grove Hall Park, the only green space in the area. We heard evidence from the Promoter and the *Association* and we were satisfied that the Promoter had taken necessary precautions to minimise the disruption to the park. However we remained concerned about the possible affect on the park. The Committee therefore stated that we would like to see Crossrail have a positive long term impact on this valued green space. We asked the Promoter to liaise with the *Association* and the Community to agree a suitable further enhancement of the park, following the Crossrail works.

46. The Promoter subsequently met with the London Borough of Tower Hamlets to discuss its plans for enhancing the park, and has spoken to and met with representatives of the Fairfield Conservation Area Residents Association to begin discussions on what they would most like to see in terms of enhancements to the park. We are pleased that the Promoter will require the nominated undertaker to work with the Fairfield Conservation Area Residents Association, and the London Borough of Tower Hamlets as the relevant local authority and landowner, in order to deliver an appropriate enhancement to the park following the Crossrail works.

### GE Pensions Limited

47. *GE Pensions Limited* is a UK company forming part of the GE Life Pensions and Insurance Group. The company owns the freehold interest of 354 to 358 Oxford Street and 1 Marylebone Lane which was proposed for compulsory acquisition for the construction of a new London Underground ticket hall and congestion relief scheme. The Petitioner wished to enter into an Over-site Development Agreement that would allow the company to use the land over the Crossrail stations or structures in that area.

---

<sup>23</sup> Paragraph 4639 [Mr Gregory Jones]

48. We agreed with the Petitioners that they should have the option of entering into an Over-site Development Agreement with the Promoter. We were encouraged to hear that further discussion would take place between the two parties on this issue and we asked the Promoter to ensure that such an agreement is offered to the Petitioners.

### Great Western Allotment Association

49. The *Great Western Allotment Association (GWAA)* represented owners of the Noel Road allotments in West Acton. The Crossrail Bill made provision for the temporary relocation of the Noel Road allotments. The Committee was told that local people from a wide variety of backgrounds and ethnicities worked side by side in the allotments, growing a range of produce from potatoes to honey. The area has been used as allotments since the war. The Petitioners were concerned about the quality of the provision during the period of the relocation.

50. The Committee asked the Promoter to prepare and till the new site for the allotment. We expected Crossrail to work in liaison with the *Association* to ensure that the location proposed by the Promoter will provide the allotment owners with workable plots with enhanced compensatory service arrangements incorporated. We expected the Promoter to enter meaningful discussion with the *Association* as soon as practicable to agree the terms of such services and facilities.

51. The Promoter told us that the nominated undertaker would be required to provide the replacement of temporary allotments in a condition fit for use as allotments for planting in the next planting season. The requirement would include clearing and levelling of the land, and providing appropriate fencing, paths between the allotments, and a metered water supply under an appropriate supplier agreement. The Promoter would also require the nominated undertaker to provide members of the *Great Western Allotment Association* who were required to move to the temporary allotments, who at the time of the move own sheds or greenhouses at the Noel Road allotments, with new equivalent facilities at the temporary allotments or, where it was practicable to do so, to relocate their existing facilities.

52. Furthermore, following discussions with the *Association*, the Promoter agreed to require the nominated undertaker to provide a temporary access footpath linking the temporary allotments to Churchill Gardens for the duration of the construction period, and to furnish the access footpath with suitable lighting. The *Association* had confirmed that the nature of the services and facilities that the Promoter was proposing to provide at the replacement temporary allotments met with its approval and that it did not wish to be provided with electricity at the temporary allotments. We therefore understand that the Promoter does not intend to provide electricity to the temporary allotments.

### London Borough of Havering

53. The *London Borough of Havering* appeared in Committee to highlight their concern that the planned Crossrail works at Romford Station did not provide adequate facilities for mobility impaired people. The Promoter, at the request of the Committee, worked with the London Borough and explored the possibility of:

- a) building a southern entrance through the existing station structure,

- b) widening of the existing mezzanine passageway, and
- c) how the design of the station foyer and treatment of the area beneath the railway bridge could improve access to the station from the south.

54. The Committee invited the Promoter to find a way to provide appropriate access for mobility-impaired people to the developed station in the location of the current ramp. We re-emphasise the need for implementing disability-friendly policies and we remain grateful to the *London Borough of Havering* and Crossrail for the redesign of the station to ensure that passengers can access the building readily. We expect the same level of regard to be shown in providing access for those with disabilities across the entire breadth of the Crossrail operations.

### **National Council of the Cycling Touring Club**

55. The National Council of the Cycling Touring Club petitioned against the Bill to ensure that the views and concerns of cyclists were taken into account throughout the Crossrail project. The Committee required Crossrail to continue its dialogue with the *National Council of the Cycling Touring Club* to ensure that the policy on the carriage of cycles was well informed.

56. The Committee accepts that the train operating company, not Crossrail, will decide the final policy but we expect it to be cycle-friendly and in line with Transport for London and London Underground policy. We asked the Promoter to highlight which stations on the route would be suitable for cyclists to safely enter and exit the Crossrail service and we are delighted that the Information Paper E2, 'Cycle Carriage and Cycle Parking', has been updated to include a map, similar in principle to London Underground's 'Bicycles on the Underground' map, that provisionally shows where it will be possible to take cycles on the Crossrail route.

### **Paddington Residents' Active Concern on Transport**

57. *Paddington Residents' Active Concern on Transport*, known as 'PRACT', was a consortium established in 1986 of four residents' associations. The Committee recognised that the residents of Brewers Court will be affected by the Bill. We therefore asked the Promoter to provide a liaison officer to make contact with the residents and to assist them with issues during the construction phase of the project. We also asked Crossrail to adopt the model recommended by the Committee in relation to the Spitalfields residents, namely to establish a local liaison group which would include local residents and local community leaders who would then be able to liaise with Crossrail throughout the construction period.

58. We welcomed the response from the Promoter which has confirmed that a dedicated community liaison point of contact for the Paddington area would be assigned in due course, and that the local community would be notified of the relevant contact details nearer to the start of construction.

59. The Promoter has discussed the Committee's recommendation on the establishment of a local liaison group for the Paddington area with Westminster City Council, *Paddington Residents' Active Concern on Transport*, and the Brewers Court Residents Association. The

Promoter reported to the Committee that there was a broad consensus on a way forward that fits the needs of the area, and confirmed that such a local liaison group would be established in due course.

### **The Congestion Zone**

60. We were also concerned that the construction of Crossrail and the traffic restrictions in place at the edge of the Congestion Zone would severely restrict the people who live within, or travel through, this area. We asked that the Promoter liaise with the Mayor of London and Transport for London (TfL) to seek a sensible way forward on this matter with a view to the temporary or permanent alteration of the boundary of the Congestion Zone to accommodate a more friendly and sustainable use of the area.

61. The Promoter discussed the possibility of relocating the Congestion Charging Zone (CCZ) boundary at Paddington with both TfL and Westminster City Council as requested. The Committee was informed that the discussions looked at both relocating the boundary temporarily during Crossrail construction, and permanently relocating it. We welcome the fact that TfL has raised no objection in principle at this stage to either the temporary or permanent relocation of the boundary, but we understand that further survey and modelling work is likely to be required by TfL to assess the impacts at Paddington and consequential impacts over the wider area before it can offer an informed view.

62. The Committee accepts that any relocation of the boundary would be a matter for TfL. However, as Crossrail is jointly promoted by TfL we remain firmly of the view that this matter is within the influence of the Promoter. We look to Crossrail and TfL to make a sensible commitment to relocating the Congestion Zone boundary.

### **Shenfield**

63. Shenfield is a major station on the Great Eastern Main Line from Liverpool Street station in the City of London to places in the East of England. It is located in Shenfield in the borough of Brentwood in Essex. The station is served by fast trains on the main line to Liverpool Street and also the stopping services of the Shenfield Metro of which it is the eastern terminus. It is proposed that the Crossrail scheme should terminate there.

64. It is appropriate to note that at the time for receiving petitions against the Bill, the Committee had no power to consider arguments relating to the alteration of the termini as proposed in the Bill. This was clearly set out in the Instruction passed by the House at Second Reading. However, there was some confusion in the debate relating to the interpretation of this Instruction. It is regrettable that the public was not given a clear message and consequently the Committee received many petitions requesting a change of the terminus for Crossrail. We heard the cases of these Petitioners on the understanding that, should we agree that a case had been made, the Committee would have to request that the House amend the Instruction agreed at Second Reading to give the Committee the power to make the necessary changes to the Bill. The Committee agreed that it did not wish to amend the bill on this issue and therefore no further procedural action was necessary. The third Instruction to the Committee, passed on 12 January 2006, allowed the Committee to consider the cases before it, albeit in a restricted manner.

65. The Committee heard extensively from residents on the issue of the terminus at Shenfield and the consequent impact on the area and for individual residents. We were grateful that the residents in Shenfield were able to put these concerns to us. The main concern for residents was that a positive case for the Crossrail terminus at Shenfield had not been made. Residents told us that they lived in an area of great character. They argued that the impact and the long-term effect of Crossrail on the area was uncertain. Petitioners argued that Crossrail would not benefit the town. The Promoter told us that the line could not terminate elsewhere without incurring greater cost.

66. In relation to the effect on the character of Shenfield, the Promoter accepted there could be an impact on the area. However, those impacts would be temporary and the Promoter argued that the area would not permanently lose the character of which residents had spoken.

67. Whilst we have every sympathy with the residents of this town, we are minded to agree with the Promoter that the station terminus should be sited here. We asked the Promoter to demonstrate that they had worked closely with the local community to ensure that appropriate noise insulation would be provided to those who would be affected by the Crossrail works.

### **Southend Arterial Road Action Group**

68. The *Southend Arterial Road Action Group* were the residents of houses built in, a cul-de-sac located alongside the Southend arterial road. Crossrail proposed to carry out works to extend and modernise existing sidings at Gidea Park, close to the arterial road. The Promoter wished to provide road access to the Gidea Park worksite (via Hall Road). We were told that the majority of the railway works in this area would be served by rail and that deliveries would include the rails, the ballast and other supplies of that kind. However, ready mix concrete would need to be brought in by road and the Promoter wished to gain access from the arterial road. The Petitioners were concerned that the amount of traffic and the size of vehicles suggested by the Promoter was not suitable for a cul-de-sac. We understood that at the peak period of construction there would be about 12 concrete lorries a day travelling along the Hall Road.<sup>24</sup>

69. The Committee agreed with the Petitioner that the cul-de-sac was not appropriate for the level of access proposed. We insisted that the Promoter find an alternative access to this worksite. The Promoter was able, on the re-examination of this issue, to propose a different site access point which did not affect the residents.

### **Barbara and Tony Wheeler and Emma Jeffery**

70. *Mr and Mrs Wheeler* appeared before the Committee on two occasions, concerned about the impact of the Crossrail tunnels beneath their property. They were also affected by the placement of two worksites in close proximity to their house.

---

24 Paragraph 9149 [Mr T Mould QC]

71. The *Mr and Mrs Wheeler* requested that floating slab track be used in the tunnels under their houses to minimise the noise of trains. The Committee also heard a petition from *Ms Emma Jeffery*, whose property would be located 15 metres above the same tunnel who had similar concerns.

72. We accepted that *Mr and Mrs Wheeler* would be clearly affected by these works and we are keen to see that efforts are made to protect them, in addition to the mitigation offered by the Promoter.

73. The Promoter agreed to instruct the nominated undertaker to install floating slab track as the permanent track support system in the Crossrail running tunnels below these properties. We were delighted to note that the installation of floating slab track under the Petitioners' houses was predicted to reduce the groundborne noise level at 1 Baldock Street (Barbara and Tony Wheeler) and at 48 Wrexham Road (Emma Jeffery) by approximately 13 decibels (dBL<sub>Amax,S</sub>).

### Floating Slab Track

74. To ensure a fair and consistent approach to Petitioners' concerns, the Committee asked the Promoter to ensure that floating slab track was installed in all tunnels which are routed under residential property at a depth of 15 metres or less. We also made it clear that, should a better technology be available before the construction of the tunnels takes place, it should be considered for use as a substitute to floating slab track.

75. The Promoter accepted the Committee's decision, and therefore will require the nominated undertaker to install floating slab track as the permanent track support system in the Crossrail running tunnels below residential buildings, where the tunnel would rise to within 15 metres or less of the building. The Committee was delighted with this commitment and was certain that it would significantly reduce the disruption experienced by those living over the Crossrail tunnels.

76. We were minded also to recommend that the entire Crossrail route used floating slab track, as the permanent track support system in the Crossrail running tunnels. Such a system would offer an enormous opportunity to reduce significantly the disruption experienced by all London residents and workers as trains pass in tunnels below them. However, we recognised that such a decision would have a considerable impact on the cost of the construction of the railway. We therefore ask the Promoter only to consider implementing floating slab track across the route if the track became cost-effective.

## 5 Petitioners requiring significant protection

---

### Areas of Soho Sound Mitigation: Grand Central Sound Studios

77. The Committee was concerned that the building and use of Crossrail would seriously affect the sound studios in the area of Soho which are regarded as an international centre of excellence. The Committee accepted that the various sound studios in the Soho area were

an exceptional example of British business, talent and ingenuity. The Committee wanted to ensure that such businesses were not seriously jeopardised by the construction or operations of Crossrail.

78. We therefore asked the Promoter to ensure that floating slab track was installed in all the tunnels in the Soho area. As before, we were clear that, should a better technology emerge before the construction of the tunnels takes place, it should be considered for use in substitute or addition to floating slab track. We wished to see floating slab track used as a minimum requirement for such tunnels.

79. We also insisted that every effort was made to provide these studios with sufficient sound proofing. Should Grand Central Sound Studios be affected by the tunnelling process, we expected that the Petitioners would be able to claim compensation under the terms set out in the Bill. We were not minded to increase the provision of compensation in this case, as we wished to ensure that the industry was protected in its current location. However, we agreed that Crossrail would need to take every reasonable mitigation measure to ensure that this important industry is able to continue working in its current location.

80. The Promoter accepted the Committee's decision, and agreed to instruct the nominated undertaker to install floating slab track as the permanent track support system in the Crossrail running tunnels in the Soho area<sup>25</sup>. The Promoter told us that Crossrail would mitigate potential groundborne noise impacts at the source of the noise. The Promoter argued that the provision of mitigation at the source would be sufficient to control the likely groundborne noise impacts for the sound recording studios concerned, including Grand Central Sound Studios. The resulting predicted reductions in groundborne noise levels indicates that there was no reason why the studios in Soho should not be able to continue working in their current location.

81. The Crossrail operational groundborne noise design criterion for sound recording studios was 30  $dB_{LAmax,S}$ . With the standard trackform, the groundborne noise level at those studios that are near to the Crossrail running tunnels in the Soho area is predicted to be between 25 and 29  $dB_{LAmax,S}$ . The installation of floating slab track is predicted to reduce the groundborne noise levels to between 10 and 18  $dB_{LAmax,S}$ .

82. The Promoter therefore believed that the provision of floating slab track as the permanent track support system in the Crossrail running tunnels in the Soho area was the most effective mitigation measure that can be taken for these sound recording studios. The Committee accepted that the mitigation measures in place would be sufficient to protect the Soho Sound Industry.

## Liverpool Street Station

83. Liverpool Street station is one of the Capital's major railway stations. It is also an extremely busy London Underground station in the north eastern corner of the City of London. It is the southern terminus of the Great Eastern Main Line, and is the main departure point from London to destinations in the East of England not served by the East

---

<sup>25</sup> The part of the route that was situated between Regent Street and Charing Cross Road.

Coast Main Line from King's Cross. One of seventeen stations managed by Network Rail, it also serves commuter services to parts of East London and Essex. It is said to be one of the busiest stations in the United Kingdom, with 123 million travellers each year, having exits to Bishopsgate, Liverpool Street and the Broadgate development.

84. The Crossrail scheme connects to Liverpool Street station, enabling passengers travelling from the east to access this transport hub. The Committee heard the petition of British Land who expressed their concern as follows: 'that at Liverpool Street Station, the Promoter is proposing to provide an inadequate ticket hall. Passengers alighting from Crossrail who choose to exit at the eastern ends of the Crossrail platforms underground will be disgorged into, and clash with, those entering and leaving the escalators which serve the Central Line underground in that part of Liverpool Street Station. They will clash with those entering and leaving the Metropolitan and Circle Line, the so-called 'sub-surface lines', as I think the experts call them. They will clash with National Rail passengers entering the ticket gates as Crossrail passengers and exiting London Underground Limited passengers leave the same gates. The gates themselves will remain seriously constrained'.<sup>26</sup>

85. The Committee was asked to consider a variety of issues at Liverpool Street Station. We were sympathetic to the argument for enhancing ticket hall facilities at the Station. The Committee asked the Promoter to find a way forward that was acceptable to both parties and in June 2006, all parties returned to update the Committee. The Promoter told the Committee that they had discussed a number of options with the City and British Land and had finally narrowed this down to five options. We should state that the options had unusual numbering due to the number of previous versions discarded by the Promoter and the Petitioners. The Committee was asked to consider options: 3b, 4c, 5a, 5b and 7a.

86. Option 3b focused on changing the gateline in the underground tickethall. Option 4c and both of the option 5s, involved moving the works to the east into the existing post office railway vaults. The work would enable an extension of the ticket hall into this area.<sup>27</sup>

87. Option 5a involved building escalators from the London Underground ticket hall directly up to the street. Option 5b would have involved the same work in the ticket hall as 4c, however, instead of putting escalators into the London Underground ticket hall, two escalators would be added onto the existing Network Rail escalators.

88. Option 7a would involve breaking through a wall into the existing sub-station and building an additional free-standing ticket hall extending up to surface level. It was not directly connected with ticket hall B.

89. We have carefully considered the final options presented to the Committee and asked the Promoter to amend the Bill to enable options 3b and 7a with the extended gate line, removing the necessary retail units, to come forward as an integral part of the Crossrail project at Liverpool Street station. We are not convinced that it was reasonable to pursue option 4c. Equally, we are not persuaded that the implementation of option 7a should be delayed.

---

26 Paragraph 176 [Mr G Laurence QC]

27 Paragraph 13199 [Ms N Lieven QC]

90. The Promoter accepted the Committee's decision and brought forward an additional provision to enable options 3b and 7a to be constructed. This development will ensure that Liverpool Street station remains a functional transport hub and we are confident that it will help end years of over-crowding in this thriving station, giving London's commuters the space they so desperately need.

## Spitalfields

91. The Committee heard a great deal of concern from the people in the Spitalfields area, especially those affected by the Hanbury Street shaft.

92. We were concerned that there has been a lack of clear information about the project in the area and we agree that a certain amount of action is necessary in the locality immediately. We were also concerned by local residents' claims that there were times when they have not been properly informed and were poorly advised during the consultation process. This had led to huge concern and distress in the local area about the extent of the Crossrail project. We have heard a great deal of evidence in Committee and we wanted to reassure the community that the scale of the works and the length of construction in the area have been largely overestimated by some residents.

## Local Monitoring Body

93. We believe that the Crossrail project must revisit the problems in the Spitalfields area. We asked the Promoter to set up a monitoring body with Tower Hamlets Borough Council and representatives within the community, especially those from the local schools affected by the works. We expect this body to meet monthly in order to provide up-to-date information to local residents about the project.

94. The Promoter agreed and acted on the concerns of the Committee. However, we were told by Petitioners that the Promoter had not done enough to set up a sufficiently independent local panel. In subsequent evidence sessions, Jil Cove from the Spitalfields Community Association told us that the Association 'did welcome the Committee charging Crossrail with the task of establishing a Community Liaison Panel along with other community groups, and the Community Association at Spitalfields were keen to engage in a positive and fruitful dialogue through this panel'.<sup>28</sup>

95. It is now our understanding that an independent charity, Planning Aid, had stepped in to facilitate the first meeting of the Community Liaison Panel and as a result of this a panel made up of local people from the Spitalfields area has been nominated. We were delighted that this has taken place and place on record our thanks to Planning Aid for allowing this meeting to happen.

## One Stop Shop

96. We also recommended that Crossrail open up a one stop shop in the Spitalfields area for the duration of the works to enable local people to report concerns and help ensure that

the works by the contractor meets with dust and noise requirements set out by the Promoter in the same way as has proved helpful in the Paddington area. In this respect, we would also like this one stop shop, working with appropriate Government agencies, to advertise how local individuals wishing to work on the project may apply for jobs connected with the project in Whitechapel and elsewhere.

### ***Schools in Spitalfields***

97. We were told that the Promoter had reached an agreement with Swanlea School regarding the hours the lorries in the area will operate. We insisted that this agreement must apply to any road which a school faces onto in the area. We were particularly concerned with access to Buxton Road and the traffic entering Valance Road. We wanted the Promoter to ensure that it employs staff to enforce access rules 24 hours a day.

98. We expect the safety and health of the children and local residents in that area to be the Promoter's first priority. The Promoter must provide a regular liaison meeting with each school to monitor these arrangements and to support the schools during the full period of the work. The Committee intended the Promoter to look at alternative proposals to avoid seeking access to their proposed worksite through the school premises.

99. The Promoter has accepted the Committee's decision that it should work with the London Borough of Tower Hamlets and Government departments, particularly the DfES, to ensure that the schools in the area are in no way disadvantaged by the works.

100. At our request, the Promoter agreed to work with the London Borough of Tower Hamlets to develop a strategy for lorry routes that take into account the nearby sensitive uses, such as schools. Where a proposed Crossrail lorry route passes any entrance to a school that is not currently subject to heavy goods traffic, the Promoter will restrict the hours during which construction traffic will operate and/or introduce appropriate traffic management measures to be agreed with the Council. These measures will include a 30 minute prohibition of Crossrail construction traffic when pupils are arriving at school and a 30 minute prohibition when pupils are leaving. The exact hours will be agreed on a case by case basis for each school.<sup>29</sup>

### ***Health in Spitalfields***

101. We were concerned that the large number of asthma sufferers and those with other respiratory illnesses in Spitalfields should be protected from the increased dust levels that would surround the Crossrail worksites which we understand to be amongst the highest indication of these particular illnesses in the UK. With this mind, we expected staff securing the roads to ensure that access is only given to lorries properly and securely covered.

102. The Promoter acknowledged our concern in relation to Buxton Street and traffic entering Valance Road and agreed to ensure that appropriate measures are taken in agreement with the London Borough of Tower Hamlets to control vehicular access on a 24

---

29 Paragraph 16829 [Ms N Lieven QC]

hour basis. We note that the Crossrail Construction Code will require all vehicles carrying loose or potentially dusty material to or from worksites to be fully sheeted. The Construction Code forms part of the Environmental Minimum Requirements that the Promoter will make binding on any nominated undertaker.

### ***Historic buildings in Spitalfields***

103. We also heard a great deal of evidence about listed buildings in the Princelet Street area. We asked the Promoter to come back to the Committee in Autumn 2007 and demonstrate clearly that an individual assessment has been made of each listed and historic building in the area and that appropriate mitigation has been put in place.

104. We are happy to report that the Promoter has done a considerable amount of work to ensure that the settlement impacts of the works on all buildings, including listed and historic buildings, have been adequately assessed and appropriate mitigation put in place.

105. The Promoter confirmed that settlement assessment reports had been produced that considered every individual structure within the predicted zone of influence along the route. The results of this assessment process are reported in one of two ways, both of which are described below.

106. Listed buildings were those buildings which are on statutory lists of buildings of 'special architectural or historic interest' compiled by the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, on advice from English Heritage. The Promoter confirmed that an individual report for all listed buildings in the Spitalfields area had been produced. An individual report was considered appropriate because these buildings are statutorily protected, and because they have been selected by English Heritage as being of national importance. The individual report included a heritage appraisal, which established a detailed understanding of the historic character and significance of the building concerned (in accordance with the criteria laid down in PPG15<sup>30</sup>) and in particular identified any features of particular architectural or historic interest or sensitivity (for example delicate plasterwork or fine stucco mouldings). Proposed mitigation in this area consists of monitoring and following best practice during tunnelling works to minimise the generation of ground movement at source. During the selection of mitigation measures, due regard was given, and will continue to be given, to the sensitivity of the particular features of the building which are of architectural or historic interest and the sensitivity of the structure of the building to ground movement. Further, these assessments, as explained to us in committee, will continue to be reviewed as the detailed design progresses.

107. All other buildings have been assessed in a series of settlement reports. Whilst presented in a different format from the listed building reports, they calculate settlement and building damage in the same way as the individual assessments. The Promoter confirmed that appropriate monitoring and mitigation for these buildings would also be provided.

---

30 Communities and Local Government, Planning Policy Guidance 15: Planning and the historic environment (originally published by DoE and DNH, September 1994)

108. We required the Promoter to monitor these buildings throughout the tunnelling process and for a minimum of seven years thereafter, following the completion of the process. Equally, we expect the Promoter to pay for the repair of any damage that occurs due to the tunnelling and associated works. These buildings must be repaired in a manner appropriate to the age of the building.

109. The Promoter agreed to continue monitoring in the Spitalfields area for a fixed seven year period after the tunnelling excavation works and to use the data obtained as a ‘control case’ to validate settlement trends across the scheme as far as it is practicable to do so. The Promoter also confirmed that under the settlement policy any material physical damage arising from ground settlement associated with the nominated undertaker’s tunnelling works will be made good at no expense to those affected, and that, particularly in the case of listed buildings, repairs would be carried out to a standard and quality commensurate with the age and fabric of the building.

## 61 Princelet Street

110. We considered carefully the case put by the Petitioners who are the owners of flats within the building at 61 Princelet Street in Spitalfields: *Alistair and Eleanor Ferguson, Ms Hamilton, Mr Collins and Ms Hatoum*. We recognised that these people will be extraordinarily affected by the Hanbury Street shaft. We wanted the Promoter to take steps to ensure that these properties were compulsorily purchased and that Petitioners would be provided with individual letters of comfort guaranteeing that the flats would be bought before the work begins.

111. The Promoter accepted the Committee’s judgement that the occupiers of the flats within 61 Princelet Street were likely to be extraordinarily affected by a shaft in Hanbury Street. The Promoter has now recognised the Committee’s continuing concern over the level of comfort afforded to these Petitioners, and on a wholly exceptional basis, has offered the three 61 Princelet Street Petitioners – Eleanor Ferguson, Mona Hatoum and Gerald Collins, and Caroline Hamilton – a revised undertaking that gives them the same level of comfort as was given to EMI. The Promoter has agreed to purchase their properties at a time of their choosing from the date of Royal Assent until the construction of the Hanbury Street shaft has been completed. The Committee is grateful to the Promoter for providing this essential undertaking.

## Old Oak Common Depot

112. The Committee has heard cases regarding the revised depot strategy detailed in the third set of Additional Provisions. The revised strategy proposes to relocate the main Crossrail depot from Romford to Old Oak Common in West London. The Committee has carefully reflected on the case of *English, Welsh and Scottish Railway Limited (EWS)* and has agreed that the depot should be located at Old Oak Common.<sup>31</sup> We wished to ensure that the necessary arrangements are in place to protect freight interests and, therefore, we accepted the undertaking offered by the Secretary of State that he would continue to work with EWS to try and find a way to retain as much as possible of EWS’s activities at Old Oak

---

31 Paragraph 20551 [Chairman]

Common, if so desired. We asked the Promoter to ensure that if the move to North Pole depot was necessary, that a turning facility would be provided to EWS, if so required.

### **London Borough of Tower Hamlets**

113. The *Borough* appeared before the Committee on 13 March 2006 to raise several issues. The Committee was satisfied with the response given by the Promoter. However, the Committee agreed that the existing Astro-Turf pitch at the Stepney Green worksite was a benefit to the local community and should be kept on a permanent basis if possible. We therefore strongly encouraged the two parties to liaise on this matter to find a solution.

### **Westbourne Park Villas Residents' Association**

114. The *Residents' Association* had requested that Crossrail moved the concrete batching plant in their area. We did not find this necessary and we were content with the Promoter's response.

115. The Committee did accept that the *Residents' Association* had legitimate concerns about the Westbourne Park footbridge. We noted that Crossrail had followed the Committee's request to make the south side of the footbridge compliant with the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) 1995. Whilst we accept that it was not Crossrail's responsibility to replace the entire bridge, we subsequently asked the Promoter to go further in making the current bridge accessible to those with restricted mobility. We asked the Promoter to develop sensible engineering design solutions and use mirrors and good lighting to enable those using the bridge to view oncoming persons. We also invited the Promoter to explore the use of a traffic light system and suitable signage to show people with restricted mobility if another wheelchair or pushchair user is approaching.

116. The Promoter agreed to require the nominated undertaker to provide appropriate lighting and, if their use was recommended by the relevant local Crime Prevention Officer, concave mirrors at appropriate points with a view to maximising sight lines so that, as far as reasonably practicable, those using the Westbourne Park footbridge would be able to see people approaching in the opposite direction. The Promoter also assured the Committee that if the access issue for people with restricted mobility could not be resolved to allow two wheelchairs to comfortably pass on the southern spans of the footbridge the Promoter would require the nominated undertaker to provide a signal system for the spans concerned that would be manually activated when someone with a wheelchair, pavement buggy or wide pushchair entered the footbridge in order to warn people approaching from the opposite direction.

### **Marriott Hotels and West India Quay Development Company (Eastern) Limited**

117. The Committee accepted that the Petitioners currently face an uncertain level of disruption during the construction of the Isle of Dogs station. We asked the Promoter to clarify at the earliest opportunity which construction scenario they intend to follow. We accepted that Crossrail would take steps to mitigate the disruption to the Petitioners and recognised that if there is a case for compensation, the code set out in the Bill would apply

and we hoped that this matter may be considered by the Committee in the House of Lords when there would be greater clarity over the construction scenario.

### Canary Wharf Group PLC

118. The Committee recognised that these Petitioners would also appreciate greater clarity on the future of the construction project. We were not in a position to offer them a great deal of comfort, although we had some sympathy with their arguments. Under Clause 6 of the Crossrail Bill the time limit for compulsory acquisition is set at five years from Royal Assent. Clause 6, subsections 7 and 8, allow the Secretary of State to extend that time limit. We believed that this provision should only allow one extension of a further five years. Furthermore, Parliament should approve such an extension only if it can be demonstrated that it is necessary. We therefore asked the Promoter to amend the Bill accordingly. The Committee was presented with the required amendment.

### Trustees of the SS Robin Trust

119. The Petitioners, the *SS Robin Trust*, are an arts and heritage organisation running participatory photography projects onboard the world's oldest complete steamship. The Committee were told that the trustees of the *SS Robin* were in the process of making a bid for a lottery heritage fund grant. We accept that negotiations are still ongoing to settle a suitable location for the ship. In the interim we asked Crossrail and the Department for Transport to write letters of comfort to the Lottery Board explaining the current situation and ensuring that the organisation did not lose out on possible funding due to the uncertainty of its relocation. The Promoter provided the trustees of the *SS Robin* with a letter of comfort for them to use with third parties as they saw fit. The Promoter told the Committee that it was fully committed to using reasonable endeavours to procure alternative moorings for the *SS Robin* within the West India Dock complex during construction. The Promoter also informed the Committee that it was committed to ongoing liaison with the *SS Robin* Trust, and with British Waterways and Canary Wharf Group, to this end.

### Residents of Poplar Dock

120. We are pleased that through much hard work and continued negotiation the residents of Poplar Dock are no longer under the threat of being relocated. We were greatly impressed by this floating community and we have strongly encouraged Crossrail and British Waterways to find an acceptable solution. We are grateful to all involved in these discussions. The parties agreed that navigable access consistent with that currently existing will be maintained during the construction of Crossrail at the Isle of Dogs subject to possible temporary restrictions during the construction of the cofferdam.<sup>32</sup> We encourage Crossrail to continue meaningful dialogue with the Petitioners.

---

32 Paragraph 21460 [Ms N Lieven QC]

### **Citipost AMP Limited and Mr Daniel Albert Charlesworth**

121. On 10 July 2007, the Committee heard the case of the only Petitioners appearing against the fourth set of additional provisions. We agreed that the Petitioners' case was unique and that they have been considerably disadvantaged by the new provisions. We welcomed the Petitioners' support of the Crossrail project and noted the positive attitude with which they had embraced the works forced upon them. We also recognised that the Petitioners had experienced financial loss and whilst we accepted that it was usual during the process of hybrid bills that parties paid their own costs, we agreed to make an award in this unique case without prejudice.

122. We therefore asked the Promoter to prepare to pay the Petitioner half the costs they incurred during the negotiations on AP3. We asked the Petitioners to prepare a list of reasonable costs incurred for the committee. We thank the Promoter for confirming that it was prepared to pay half of the reasonable costs that the Petitioners incurred in negotiating the proposals that were incorporated in the third set of Additional Provisions deposited in November 2006.

123. The Committee noted that the Promoter has written to the Petitioners, asking for details of these costs, with a view to agreeing a figure with the Petitioners. In the absence of agreement being reached, the issue could be referred for assessment to the taxing officer of the House of Commons in accordance with the Parliamentary Costs Act 2006.

## 6 Groundborne Noise and Vibration

---

124. A railway project such as Crossrail is expected to generate certain levels of noise and vibration. Understandably, many Petitioners were concerned about this issue as they live or work above the proposed tunnels. The local authorities presented a joint case to express their concerns about vibration and groundborne noise and the impact on the properties above the railway. We were keen to establish what measures the Promoter proposed to put in place to control the effects of groundborne noise and vibration that might otherwise arise from the construction and operation of the railway. We spent time with several noise experts measuring the noise levels of the District Line on London Underground to provide us with a better understanding of the issues.

125. Where we thought it necessary, we have asked the Promoter to provide additional measures to protect certain Petitioners from unreasonable levels of disruption. However, it is our view that the undertakings given by the Promoter on these issues will generally provide adequate protection for those impacted by the railway.

126. Groundborne noise could arise from the movement of trains or tunnelling equipment in Crossrail tunnels, during construction of the railway, during commissioning of the railway, or once the railway is operating passenger services. There are no UK legislative standards or criteria that define when groundborne noise becomes significant. Crossrail has therefore drawn upon available experience in constructing new underground railways, for example the Jubilee Line Extension, Thameslink and the Channel Tunnel Rail Link. All of these projects adopted a threshold of significance for groundborne noise in residential properties of 40dB<sub>LAMax,s</sub>.

127. This criterion was therefore adopted to assess the significance of potential groundborne noise impacts in residential properties during both construction and operation of Crossrail. In the case of buildings used as reference libraries, lecture theatres, auditoria, theatres, hospitals, churches, schools and similar buildings, the use of which is particularly sensitive to noise or vibration, either the same or more stringent assessment criteria were adopted.

128. Crossrail has set out a series of mitigation measures which the nominated undertaker would be required to take. The potential impact of Crossrail trains running through tunnels during construction and operation of the railway has been assessed and the findings reported in the Environmental Statement. The running of both the construction and permanent railways is not forecast to cause vibration impacts which will be felt by those occupying the buildings above. Vibration from the passage of the tunnel boring machines may be perceptible. However, this will be a transient effect lasting only a few days at any one location and will not cause damage to buildings.

129. A detailed explanation of the technical arguments can be found in Crossrail Information Paper D10 – (Groundborne Noise and Vibration)<sup>33</sup> and in the transcripts of our hearings.<sup>34</sup>

---

33 <http://billdocuments.crossrail.co.uk/80256FA10055060F/pages/informationpapers>

## 7 Revised Tunnelling Strategy

---

130. On 30 March 2006 the then Secretary of State announced changes to the tunnelling strategy through Tower Hamlets. CLRL had carried out a ‘fundamental’ review and had concluded that there would no longer be a need to launch tunnel-boring machines from Hanbury Street in east London. It had concluded that by significantly recasting the construction programme it was possible to accommodate the major part of the tunnelling activities from the two tunnel boring machine launch sites already proposed at Royal Oak in west London and between Canary Wharf and Custom House in the Docklands area of east London. Therefore Crossrail would not need to launch tunnel boring machines from Hanbury Street in east London. This was a significant achievement as it would significantly reduce the environmental impacts in Tower Hamlets.

131. We were pleased to learn that there would be no need for the works between Hanbury Street and Pedley Street or the conveyor along the Great Eastern main line. Mile End Park would not be needed as a site for stockpiling excavated material. A shaft would still need to be constructed at Hanbury street for ventilation and intervention, but this will be a much smaller structure, involving less work and so reducing disruption to the local community.

132. The Committee welcomed the revised tunnelling strategy. Tower Hamlets is an area of considerable social deprivation and reducing the railway’s impact on the area was clearly beneficial.

## 8 Woolwich Station

---

### Issues relating to Woolwich station

133. On 25 July 2006 we announced a series of interim decisions to allow the Government to undertake work with a view to amending the Crossrail Bill. These included a recommendation that there should be a station at Woolwich. The Promoter's response to these recommendations was published on 11 October 2006. The Promoter rejected the Committee's request to bring forward an additional provision for Woolwich Station. We regret that, in response to these developments, the Government insisted that the Committee had exceeded its powers in considering the new station.

134. During the subsequent debate the Committee pointed out that during our consideration of the Bill, the Government had the power to propose an instruction to the House of Commons instructing the Committee not to consider any particular aspect of the project. For example just as we were directed not to consider Reading, we could also have been instructed not to consider a station at Woolwich. The Government could also have challenged the *locus standi* of the Woolwich Petitioners, but chose to give their own evidence. We heard ten days of evidence for and against a station at Woolwich and came to our decision based on the information before us. We urged the Government 'in the strongest possible terms, to reconsider its position on this matter and to respect our views'. In a Parliamentary debate on 31 October 2006, the then Secretary of State maintained his position challenging the financial viability and desirability of a station at Woolwich.<sup>35</sup>

135. Subsequently the Committee made a Special Report to the House on 1 November 2006, to highlight our dissatisfaction with proceedings, regarding Crossrail and Woolwich. We strongly agreed with the arguments presented to us regarding the addition of a station at Woolwich. We also visited the proposed site with representatives from each party. We noted that the Petitioners' calculations of cost for this station showed that it would provide exceptional value for money and we called upon the Promoter to bring forward the necessary additional provision to add this to the Bill.

136. In March 2007 the Government announced that the station would now go ahead on the basis that the cost could be met by a private company, Berkeley Homes. The key to this has been the *London Borough of Greenwich's* recent proposal for a major revision to its spatial plan, to allow a significantly higher density of development at Woolwich. This, in turn, had prompted Berkeley Homes to offer a means of enabling a station to be built at Woolwich but, crucially, without adding to the current cost of Crossrail. In light of this, agreement had been reached in principle with Berkeley Homes under which they would build the basic box structure of a station at Woolwich and then construct their own development overhead. All this would be done at their own risk, using their own money, to the specification laid down by CLRL, with a payment back to Berkeley Homes equivalent to the saving CLRL would make through avoiding other works at Woolwich, when it constructed the line there. In due course, Berkeley Homes would then arrange for the completion of the station box to full operational status. Both they and Greenwich Council

---

35 Crossrail Bill Committee, First Special Report of Session 2005–06, The Crossrail Bill: Woolwich Station, HC 1597

recognise that the completion of the station would be conditional on receiving sufficient funding contributions from those developers and businesses that stand to benefit from a Crossrail station at Woolwich. A new Instruction to the Committee to allow for this development was approved by the House on 25 April 2007.

137. The Promoter has told us that they recognised that a strong case has been made for a station at Woolwich. In the light of our decision, the Promoter has looked over the summer at the design of a station to explore ways of reducing its very high cost. A key reason why the station would be expensive to build is the depth of the running tunnels. A shallower station would be possible if the running tunnels in that area were nearer to the surface. This appears, in principle, to be feasible although much more detailed work would be needed to understand the wider environmental consequences. The cost of a shallower station is in the order of £200m.

138. We were pleased that the Secretary of State followed the request of the Committee and brought forward the necessary additional provisions to build a station at Woolwich. However, we have been concerned about the cautionary language used by the Promoter when bringing forward this additional provision. **This Committee has always been firmly of the view that there must be a fully operational station at Woolwich. We have seen the evidence that demonstrates it will provide exceptional value for money and be a valuable transport link in an area of considerable deprivation. Accordingly, we reiterate our view that the station at this site is and must remain central to the project.**

## 9 Freight

---

139. Freight services operate throughout Great Britain, carrying products as diverse as cars, chemicals, consumer goods, steel, railway engineering supplies, coal, aggregates, and timber. Some freight train operating companies including *English, Welsh and Scottish Railway Ltd (EWS)*, the largest British rail freight company, petitioned against the Crossrail Bill, arguing that the current proposals would unfairly use up much of the remaining rail capacity within the London area, and did not provide the necessary extra capacity on connecting lines. It was argued that this would make it harder to route freight services from the southern ports to the north and would increase freight transit times.

140. Petitioners from the freight industry asked that the Bill be amended so that their business could not be ‘forced off the railway at the behest of Crossrail when they had made proper arrangements to enter on to the railway’<sup>36</sup>. They also argued that the Crossrail operating timetable be properly prepared so as to secure a commitment that freight could be carried on the railway.<sup>37</sup>

141. The Committee is persuaded that the freight industry faces an increasing challenge, with current capacity insufficient for the needs of growth and we believe that the Government should take steps to address this. However, the Committee believes that these issues are largely the responsibility of Network Rail and others rather than that of the Crossrail project. The Committee was concerned about the uncertainty regarding the Access Option. We look to the Committee in the House of Lords to ensure that Access Option and any other remaining issues relating to the freight industry are adequately evaluated.

---

36 Paragraph 15713 [Mr T Straker QC]

37 Paragraph 15714 [Mr T Straker QC]

## 10 The Environmental Statements and the Environmental Impact Assessment

---

142. An Environmental Statement (ES) was published with the Crossrail Bill on 22 February 2005. The publication of the ES formed part of the required process of the production of the Environmental Impact Assessment. The results of the consultation, together with the Environmental Statement itself and any responses from the Secretary of State, will combine to create an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the project.

143. The Department for Transport invited comments on the main ES when it was published in February 2005. That comment period closed on 10 June 2005, and a report compiling the submissions was presented to both Houses of Parliament and published before Second Reading of the Bill. The Department also invited comments on the four Supplementary Environmental Statements,<sup>38</sup> and collated in the four Amendment of Provisions Environmental Statements.<sup>39</sup> Comments received by the Department will be compiled into a report that will be presented to both Houses of Parliament and published before Third Reading of the Bill in the House of Commons.

144. Petitioners have been allowed to raise issues relating to the EIA before the Committee, they have been able to call evidence and to question witnesses for the Promoter, and we have been able to request amendments, undertakings and assurances if we deemed it necessary.

145. We recognise that the provision of information on the Bill has been extensive and widespread. The Promoter was required to deposit documents in public libraries and with local authorities and significant amounts of information have been made available electronically via the internet by, for example, the CLRL, DfT and the Parliamentary website.

### Issues raised in petitions relating to Environmental Impact

146. We note that the House agreed ‘that the Select Committee, without comment, report to the House for its consideration any issue relating to the environmental impact of the railway transport system for which the Bill provides that is raised in a Petition against the Bill, but which the Select Committee is prevented from considering by the practice of the House’. Accordingly, we detail a summary below those issues raised in Committee in order that the House might give them due consideration. We would strongly recommend that Members referred to the Minutes of Evidence given in Committee to gain a full understanding of the issues summarised below.

---

38 The first Supplementary Environmental Statement (SES1) was published on 26 May 2005. On 18 January 2006, a second Supplementary Environmental Statement (SES2) for Crossrail was published. A third SES (SES3) was published on 7 November 2006, an SES3 errata was published on 25 January 2007. A fourth SES (SES4) was published on 16 May 2007.

39 On 18 January 2006, Amendment of Provisions Environmental Statement (APES 1) for Crossrail was published. On 9 May 2006 a second Amendment of Provisions Environmental Statement (APES 2) was published. A third APES (APES3) was published on 7 November 2006. A fourth APES (APES4) was published on 16 May 2007.

### *Petition No. 27 – James Middleton*

147. The Petitioner considered that the Crossrail project, as proposed, provided a totally inadequate rail network. The Committee were told that it should be a strategic scheme covering the wider areas of South East and East of England, based on the successful Thameslink and Thameslink 2000 strategy, rather than a slower, all stations, London-only metro operation.

148. The Petitioner believed that although the business case for Crossrail stressed the need for provision of efficient and reliable travel across a wide geographical area and the Promoter's scheme did nothing to provide it.

### *Petition No. 33 – Christopher Brown*

149. The Petitioner informed the Committee that he felt there would be no useful public purpose by terminating at Shenfield in the North Eastern branch of Crossrail. The Petitioner believed public interest would be better served by terminating Crossrail at Stratford, or such other place on the eastern edge of the main conurbation of London as might conveniently serve the principal objective of the Promoter.

### *Petition No. 34 – LA21 Traffic/Transport Group*

150. The Petitioners believed that the South Eastern route should have been extended to Ebbsfleet rather than the proposed Crossrail terminal at Abbey Wood. The Petitioner believed that termination at Abbey Wood would attract even more traffic to over-congested roads in Bexley and that there would be insufficient parking provision in that location.

151. The Committee was informed by the Petitioner that South East London, without an underground or tram, and an adequate rail structure, lacked an appropriate public Transport system. They considered that the lack of a proper extension on this route would not provide a much needed solution to the current problem.

### *Petition No. 43 – Ms. Minnie Cockell*

152. The Petitioner proposed that the North Eastern section should terminate at Stratford, consequently creating links with all existing Great Eastern services, the North London Line, the new Eurostar Station and the Jubilee and Central underground lines and the Docklands Light Railway, that currently served the region.

### *Petition No. 65 – Martin Salter MP*

153. The Petitioner aired concerns that the Bill makes no provision for the funding of Crossrail and observed that no firm target date has been set for the exercise of the powers sought by the Promoter, or for the commencement of the works to be authorised by the Bill. The Petitioners was also concerned that in the absence of funding, and following the successful bid for the Olympic Games in 2012, the construction and completion of Crossrail may be postponed for an indefinite period.

*Petition No. 68 – Alistair and Susan Ennals*

154. The Petitioner considered that the North Eastern section should terminate at Stratford or London Liverpool Street rather than Shenfield.

*Petition No. 69 – Covent Garden Community Association*

155. The Committee heard how the ‘liveability’ of the area above and near the proposed route, colloquially known as the ‘West End’ would be affected detrimentally. The Petitioner believed that the West End suffered from chronic overcrowding and that the streets and pavements were never meant to carry the large numbers of people and vehicles which currently existed. The Petitioner considered that the proposed route with its linkage to stations along Oxford Street would achieve an undesirable increase of numbers of visitors to the West End. We heard that the Petitioner preferred a Northern Alignment<sup>40</sup> that would allow additional numbers of people to be spread out over a greater area, offering alternative shopping and working areas which in turn would relieve some of the overcrowding.

*Petition No. 72 – London Transport Users Committee and Rail Passengers Council*

156. The Petitioners were concerned about the failure of the proposed railway transport system to serve London City Airport. The Petitioners recognised that consideration has already been given to moving Custom House station further east to provide a direct link with London City Airport but that the cost of so doing has been adjudged too high.

*Petition No. 87 – Darren Richard Williams and Petition No. 88 – Heath Lionel Sean McArdle*

157. The Petitioners objected to the location of the terminus of Crossrail at Shenfield. The Petitioners were concerned that the decision to locate the terminus was based on grounds of cost, alternative options (for example at Stratford) being considered too expensive because they required the construction of a station underground.

*Petition No. 88 – Jessica Da Silva and others*

158. The Petitioners believed that promotion of the Bill was premature as alternative worksites, routes and tunnelling methodology had not been examined in detail and as a result the best alternative taking all criteria into account had not been selected in breach of the European Community Directive on ‘the assessment of the effects of certain private and public projects on the environment’

*Petition No. 106 – Belal Uddin and others*

159. The Petitioners considered that the Promoter should have demonstrated proof of the need for and desirability of the proposals in the Bill, as affecting the Properties, and that the

---

40 The Northern Alignment is an alternative tunnel route taking the tunnels north of the alignment set out in the Bill.

limits of deviation of Works Nos. 1/3A and 1/3B, the resulting powers for the compulsory acquisition of subsoil, the power to construct works and the exercise of works and ancillary powers within the limits of deviation should be restricted in relation to the Petitioners' properties to the extent (if any) to which they could be strictly justified and so as to prevent interference with the Properties. In particular, the Petitioners contended that any interest in their properties acquired by the Promoter (in terms of the area over which it is to subsist, the form in which it was to take at law and any express or implied constraints which may be imposed upon the remainder of the Petitioners' properties) should be strictly limited only to that which was absolutely necessary for the construction, safe operation and maintenance of the proposed works

160. The Petitioners therefore believed that the Promoter should not be permitted by means of the Bill to interfere with private property rights and interests unless, and except to the extent (if any) that, there was no better alternative to the route alignment taking all criteria into account and it can be demonstrated to be necessary for the purposes of the Bill and to be in the public interest.

#### *Petition No. 107 – Robin Tutty and others*

161. The Petitioners believed that the Promoter should not be permitted by means of the Bill to interfere with private property rights and interests unless, and except to the extent (if any) that, there was no better alternative to the route alignment taking all criteria into account and it could be demonstrated to be necessary for the purposes of the Bill and to be in the public interest. The Petitioners had not been provided with full justification for the proposals in the Bill affecting the Properties and they were not satisfied that it was necessary or expedient for the other powers of the Bill to apply at all or in the manner or to the extent proposed. The Petitioners accordingly considered that the Promoter should have demonstrated the need for and desirability of the proposals in the Bill, as affecting the Properties and that the limits of deviation of Works Nos. 1/3A and 1/3B, the resulting powers for the compulsory acquisition of subsoil, the power to construct works and the exercise of works and ancillary powers within the limits of deviation should be restricted in relation to the Petitioners' properties to the extent (if any) to which they can be strictly justified and so as to prevent interference with the Properties. In particular, the Petitioners contended that any interest in their properties acquired by the Promoter (in terms of the area over which it was to subsist, the form in which it was to take at law and any express or implied constraints which may be imposed upon the remainder of the Petitioners' properties) should be strictly limited only to that which was absolutely necessary for the construction, safe operation and maintenance of the proposed works.

#### *Petition No. 110 – East of England Regional Assembly*

162. The Petitioner supported the principle of providing extra rail capacity to relieve the heavily congested rail and underground network within London, which underlie the Crossrail proposals. The Petitioner also generally supported proposals which would improve connections from stations to the east of London and stations to the west of London via Liverpool Street station and the proposed central London tunnel. However, the Petitioner was concerned that, because the current proposals did not extend beyond

Shenfield, this would not achieve the full potential of the Crossrail scheme and would not fully meet the needs of the East of England region.

*Petition No. 119 – Spitalfields Festival Ltd*

163. The Petitioners considered that the Promoter should not be permitted by means of the Bill to interfere with private property rights and interests unless, and except to the extent (if any) that, there was no better alternative to the route alignment taking all criteria into account and it could be demonstrated to be necessary for the purposes of the Bill and to be in the public interest. The Petitioners had not been provided with full justification for the proposals in the Bill affecting the Properties and they were not satisfied that it was necessary or expedient for the other powers of the Bill to apply at all or in the manner or to the extent proposed.

*Petition No. 132 – Gregory D Hodgkiss and Claire M J M Hodgkiss*

164. The Petitioners believed that the Promoter's scheme should cause eastbound Crossrail services to terminate at Stratford and provide suitable inter-change facilities there with the existing fast services from Shenfield and beyond. They considered the requirements of the services for the 2012 London Olympics should be taken into account.

*Petition No. 149 – Brentwood Borough Council*

165. The Petitioners were concerned about the impact of the construction of the railway on existing rail services at Shenfield station and the operation of the station itself. Shenfield is an important mainline station for commuters travelling into London. It provides a fast non-stop route into Liverpool Street station, and Shenfield station was therefore used by many commuters across the Petitioners' Borough and beyond. The Petitioners had serious doubts about whether Crossrail would provide any benefits at all to residents and businesses in their Borough. They could not see any advantage in the proposed extension of Crossrail to their Borough. They believed that the railway should terminate either at Stratford or Romford; where there would be benefits to those using the line to access London, Heathrow Airport, or the west of England, and that it should not be extended to the Petitioners' Borough. The Committee noted that if Crossrail should extend, as proposed, to Shenfield, that the Petitioners sought assurances and undertakings from the promoter about the effect of construction operations on Shenfield station, and in particular wished to ensure that service patterns are guaranteed.

*Petition No. 155 – Robert McCracken*

166. The Petitioner objected to the location of the proposed route and believed that an alternative northern route (for many years known as the 'Northern Alignment') should be considered instead. The Petitioner believed that the Northern Alignment would not only bring far greater benefits to residents and businesses than the proposed route, but also that a great number of nuisance issues related to Crossrail would be avoided were it to be built.

*Petition No. 195 – Patricia Gaynor Jones*

167. The Petitioner believed that the Promoter should not be permitted to interfere with private property rights and interests unless, that, there was no better alternative to the route alignment taking all criteria into account and it could be demonstrated to be necessary for the purposes of the Bill and to be in the public interest. The Petitioner had not been provided with full justification for the proposals in the Bill affecting the Property and she was not satisfied that it was necessary or expedient for the other powers of the Bill to apply at all or in the manner or to the extent proposed.

*Petition No. 206 – Cardinal Group Ltd*

168. The Petitioner regarded it as noteworthy and regrettable that the Environmental Statement accompanying the Bill did not make an adequate attempt to justify the dismissal of the alternatives considered before the introduction of the Bill. The Petitioners objected to the provisions in the Bill.

*Petition No. 219 – Thames Gateway London Partnership*

169. The Petitioners were aware that there had been suggestions that the construction of the project should be phased. The Petitioners were particularly keen to ensure that the South Eastern section of the line from Whitechapel to Abbey Wood was built as part of the first phase of construction due to the immense importance of the project as a driver of the regeneration of the Thames Gateway and the lack of adequate heavy rail capacity in this corridor.

170. The Petitioners believed that if the decision was made to construct the project in phases, an undertaking should be sought from the Promoter that the South Eastern section and a Royal Docks station at Custom House would form part of the first phase of the Crossrail works and that this would not stop short of the Royal Docks area.

171. The Petitioners sought an assurance that, should it be determined that the Stratford branch of the project was to be delayed because of irreconcilable conflicts with the Olympic construction activities, the southern section from Whitechapel to Abbey Wood would not be delayed and would be constructed as part of the first phase and a full service provided.

172. The Petitioners wished to emphasise the importance of the timely delivery of the project and reiterated the belief of all of their partners that it would be imperative that Crossrail progressed on its current schedule, in order to create a climate of confidence among private sector investors, upon whom the successful regeneration of the area ultimately rested.

*Petition No. 227 – John Akker; Petition No. 228 – Oliver Theis and others; Petition No. 229 – Ali Nehru; and Petition No. 230 – The Spitalfields Practice;*

173. We noted the Petitioners' concerns that a project of this sort would now be subject to much more detailed design work than it appeared had been undertaken. They were concerned that not only was such detail missing and as such the current scheme and its

impact had not been properly analysed and the most appropriate tunnelling methodology, and worksites and route alignment had not been chosen taking all criteria into account but the Petitioners understood that no or no sufficient budget was available for its progression at this stage. The Petitioners believed that in consequence, the impacts upon their properties, businesses, neighbourhood, families and other interests were still ill-defined and they were handicapped in their ability to engage with the Promoter in a positive fashion to safeguard their interests.

#### *Petition No. 238 – Derek James Hurst*

174. Whilst acknowledging the benefits of rail travellers being able to cross London without having to interchange there, the Petitioner considered that it was unnecessary to run the line to and from Shenfield.

#### *Petition No. 240 – Roy Archer Wise and Dorothy Monica Wise*

175. The Petitioners felt that there were little or no benefit for Shenfield and had been informed by experts that this scheme was likely to inhibit the semi-fast non-rush hour train service, as well as freight trains, due to the proposed use of the slow lines by the Promoter's trains. They believed there was no justification for the proposed terminus to be placed at Shenfield in the heart of a desirable residential area because of the obvious lack of its viability.

#### *Petition No. 240 – Jean Doris Austin and Frank Austin*

176. The Petitioners believed that as South Essex was already well served with an efficient and fast rail service that the Promoter should endeavour to locate the Crossrail Terminus in the East London area. The Terminus should be located at Stratford where existing services were already in place and connections have proved satisfactory. This would be less damaging to housing and more economic. They felt there was no justification for the proposed terminus to be placed at Shenfield in the heart of a desirable residential area because of the obvious lack of its viability.

#### *Petition No. 241 – Michael Peter Kingshott and Janet Ann Kingshott*

177. The Petitioners while accepting the benefits of Crossrail to Greater London saw no significant virtue in its extension to Shenfield bearing in mind the environmental impact on Shenfield and its residents. The Petitioners suggested that the Promoter therefore consider a cheaper and less disruptive location for their terminus either closer to or further out of London.

#### *Petition No. 246 – Madeline and Robert Wright*

178. The Petitioners believed there was no reason why the proposal should be brought out as far as Shenfield. They considered that the opportunity afforded by the success of the 2012 Olympic Bid should have given the ideal opportunity for the turn round terminal to be sited at Stratford during all the redevelopments thus reducing costs and massive supplementary disruption to the Shenfield area over several years.

*Petition No. 247 – Michael Wood and Natalie Victoria Wood*

179. The Petitioners objected because the benefits presented by the Promoter for terminating the Crossrail service at Shenfield were inconclusive. They believed that termination of the Crossrail service at Stratford would retain the existing fast and ‘all stations’ services into Essex and East Anglia, as well as allowing interconnection with main line, underground, light railway and Eurostar services. They considered that termination at Shenfield offered none of those advantages and therefore the business case for termination at Stratford as opposed to Shenfield should be re-examined.

*Petition No. 250 – David William Dunsdon and Diane Lesley Dunsdon*

180. The Petitioners could not understand the provision of the improved rail service as a ‘fast’ train service was already available from Shenfield to Liverpool Street station and this was the only line that was used by the majority of commuters, including the Petitioners, travelling to the city.

*Petition No. 251 – Philip Edward Davies and Karen Elizabeth Davies*

181. The Petitioners contended that the loss of car parking facilities, traffic congestion, noise and the cost of constructing the service through to Shenfield Station was not justified given the limited demand and the minimal saving in time in travel to London. They considered that the existing service to and from Stratford was adequate and that the Promoter should terminate the Crossrail service at Stratford.

*Petition No. 254 – Amanda Louise McShee*

182. The Petitioner could not understand why a small town such as Shenfield would be subjected to the amount of turmoil that Crossrail would create for a period of 18 months or more.

*Petition No. 256 – Peter and Queenie Cross*

183. The Petitioners believed that should the maintenance depot be located at an alternative site other than the North Eastern route, then the Promoter’s case for extending the route to Shenfield would be undermined.

*Petition No. 258 – Ian and Doreen Marshall; Petition No. 260 – John and Helen McNess; Petition No. 261 – Kenneth Charles James Cork and Marion Jill Cork; and Petition No. 274 – Janet Weller for the Hutton Mount Association*

184. The Petitioners were concerned about the proposed construction of the Romford Depot. Whilst its construction was not in the vicinity of the Petitioners, they contended that its selection as a depot site, and by implication the rejection of alternative sites, strengthened the Promoter’s case for extending the North Eastern Route to terminate at Shenfield which would have otherwise been weakened. The Petitioners believed that if the maintenance depot was located at an alternative site that was not on the North East route, then the Promoter’s case for extending the route to Shenfield would be undermined. The

Petitioners also believed that the selection of Shenfield as a terminus was strongly influenced by the selection of Romford as a depot site. The Petitioners considered that the cost/benefit analysis only proved favourable to the Promoter if the current Metro 'slow train' service was merged into the Promoter's planned services. They considered the absence along the North East route of a maintenance depot would dilute the cost/benefit requirements of the Promoter. The Petitioners also considered that the proposition for merging the current Metro service into the Promoter's Crossrail service was considerably weakened if the depot was not constructed at Romford or elsewhere on the North East route.

#### *Petition No. 259 – Thomas and Mairead O'Driscoll*

185. The Petitioners considered the whole project to be unnecessary and felt that it would cause very severe disruption to Shenfield and the surrounding areas during construction. They also felt that Stratford should be the terminus on the North Eastern route.

#### *Petition No. 262 – Maxine Fanning, Thomas George Fanning and Ross Fanning*

186. The Committee note that Shenfield was a small, quiet, close knit community and the Petitioners were fearful that the Promoter's intentions with regard to the station and surrounding area would have a detrimental affect on the Petitioner's immediate environment. The Petitioners therefore felt that the Promoter should look to cease their intended works at Stratford or Romford which would allow the Promoter to cater for the proposed increase in population following development of those areas without the need to inflict unnecessary and unwanted changes on Shenfield and its residents.

#### *Petition No. 263 – Mr Pete Best and Mrs Marjorie Best*

187. The Petitioners accepted the benefits of being able to cross London from East to West by train with the minimum inconvenience, but believed that as there was already an excellent Metro service through Shenfield and also a fast train service from Colchester, Ipswich, Norwich, etc that stop at Stratford; there seemed to be little advantage in view of the significant disruption to Shenfield and the significant cost, of starting the Crossrail service at Shenfield rather than at Stratford.

#### *Petition No. 265 – Beryl Joyce Clark*

188. The Petitioner considered that documents produced by the Promoter indicated no significant increase in rail traffic between Shenfield and east London (Environmental Statement Vol. 3 Para. 10.20.47) whilst indicating that most of the traffic would be carried between Whitechapel, Bond Street and Paddington (Environmental Statement – Non Technical Summary, Page 9).

#### *Petition No. 266 – Leonard William Ralph Webb and Gwendoline Webb*

189. The Petitioners considered the Promoter's view belief of easier and quicker travel into Central London are for most travellers incorrect. They felt that Network Rail already did

and would continue to provide fast through trains to Stratford and Liverpool Street, where most journeys terminate, or that travellers transfer to one of the many underground or suburban lines or to the buses to complete their journeys.

190. They also felt that the Promoter of the Bill had failed to adequately consider alternatives to Shenfield as the site for the Essex terminus. They believed that the obvious place for the terminus would be Stratford which would have left the east coast line unaffected. It was the Petitioner's opinion that should development at Stratford or its near environs be prohibitively expensive a further option would be to build a new station and terminus on currently uncultivated farmland and woodland at Mountnessing Parkway, two miles beyond Shenfield. The Petitioners would propose that the Mountnessing Parkway be sited alongside and to the east of the main east coast line at Arnolds Wood and bounded to the north by Lower Road Mountnessing and to the south by the Southend branch line. The Mountnessing Parkway could be constructed, using up to date technology to provide maximum security for pedestrians and parked vehicles and optimised for ease of access for public and private transport. A major advantage would be an optimal track layout and an adequate sized car park for current and importantly future needs.

#### *Petition No. 267 – A D Sutherland and Rachel A Sutherland*

191. The Petitioners objected to the Bill because they believe it was unnecessary for the railway transport system to be built to Shenfield. They considered there was a widespread view that few people would use the service at Shenfield since, as the Promoter stated at a public meeting in Shenfield, the existing faster trains to and from Stratford and London Liverpool Street were to be continued. The Petitioners considered that their interests could be protected by the amendment of the route of the proposed railway to terminate where substantial customer demand was expected, such as at Stratford.

#### *Petition No. 270 – Valerie Hibberd and Evelyn Watson*

192. The Petitioners considered that Crossrail could commence at Stratford rather than Shenfield. There was already an excellent rapid rail service to both Stratford and Liverpool Street, as well as a regular metro service between those stations and Shenfield thus, they believed, Crossrail would introduce an element of duplication.

#### *Petition No. 271 – Chris and Nicola Ashton*

193. The Petitioners believed that the proposal to extend the Crossrail out as far as Shenfield would be of no benefit to Shenfield residents or businesses, and nor would it be of any benefit to anyone travelling from Essex to Heathrow.

#### *Petition No. 272 – Jan and Michael Pointer*

194. The Petitioners considered that the vast expenditure for the Stratford to Shenfield extension as presently proposed and the inevitable disruption and noise during necessary works were totally unjustifiable in terms of anticipated usage, service quality and financial return and would seriously disadvantage users of the existing commuter and long distance services.

*Petition No. 273 – Clive Jonathan Corris and others*

195. The Petitioners believed that the costs, to residents, to rail travellers, users of the retail businesses in Shenfield and the environment, associated with the Promoter proposal to make Shenfield the eastern terminus, in preference to terminating their railway transport system at Stratford, significantly outweigh any demonstrable benefits.

*Petition No. 277 – Brentwood Chamber of Commerce*

196. We noted that 93 per cent of respondents to the Brentwood Chamber of Commerce believed that Crossrail should not end at Shenfield, but rather that it should end at Stratford in the London Borough of Newham.

*Petition No. 278 – Stuart and Tamsin Owens*

197. The Petitioners believed that the provision for Crossrail to terminate at Shenfield had not been sufficiently investigated and termination at Stratford would still meet all of the requirements for a cross London rail link and would cause less upheaval and disruption.

*Petition No. 278 – Mia Forbes Pirie*

198. The Petitioner considered that the Promoter should not be permitted by means of the Bill to interfere with private property rights and interests unless, and except to the extent (if any) that, there was no better alternative to the route alignment taking all criteria into account and it could be demonstrated to be necessary for the purposes of the Bill and to be in the public interest. The Petitioner had not been provided with full justification for the proposals in the Bill affecting the Property and she was not satisfied that it was necessary or expedient for the other powers of the Bill to apply at all or in the manner or to the extent proposed.

*Petition No. 291 – Fairfield Conservation Area Residents Association*

199. The Petitioners considered that the Promoter's approach had been to develop a proposal based on a particular route rather than to consider the options and alternatives. Such a proposal was essentially an engineering solution to a series of challenges resulting from a predefined selection. The Petitioners believed that the proposal presented its own justification without adequately exploring alternatives.

*Petition No. 304 – Clive David Diebelius*

200. The Petitioner questioned the need for Crossrail to run trains between Stratford and Shenfield to replace the One Great Eastern service. The Petitioner raised the question as to why the Crossrail line was not running via the Thames Gateway, given population trends suggest the biggest redevelopment will be in the Thames Gateway. The Petitioner would like the Thames Gateway option surveyed in greater detail as it would appear that Crossrail had not undertaken a major survey or review in light of recent developments.

201. The Petitioner considered the possibility of terminating the Crossrail service at Stratford, as Stratford would be a hub for the Olympics and the current One Great Eastern train service would remain unaffected.

202. The Petitioner also considered that the current One Great Eastern Service could be upgraded to ten carriage trains. This would increase capacity into Liverpool Street by 25 percent. He felt the only requirement would be for platform lengthening and the modification to the track layout at Liverpool Street, which could be done without vast investment in comparison to Crossrail.

### *Petition No. 305 – Woodseer and Hanbury Residents Association*

203. The Petitioners believed that other alternatives had not been properly or in some cases considered at all that neither of these aspects was considered before settling upon the current scheme and the route.

204. The Petitioners requested that the Promoter provide a detailed Transport Case or any other underlying reports as requested previously.

205. The Petitioners would be concerned if the principle of the Bill was to include the provision of an intermediate station at Whitechapel, for which the Promoter had not yet proved the case.

### *Petition No. 307 – Jemima Broadbridge*

206. The Petitioner considered that the Promoter should be required to demonstrate that all outstanding and justified concerns together with the environmental impacts of this project on the Spitalfields area, and which were set out in her Petition, had been addressed and resolved to the satisfaction of the Petitioner according to current environmental laws.

207. The Petitioner felt the Promoter should be required to provide comprehensive evidence and justification as to why the end-to-end tunnelling method of construction for the central London tunnel was not considered as a more appropriate means of proceeding with the project.

### *Petition No. 310 – Thomas Sparks and Susan Goodbody*

208. The Petitioners felt that to spend so much money developing a new rail service, with its attendant infrastructure, from scratch, seemed incomprehensible. They considered that the money could be better spent improving the existing Underground and Railway network in the South East area of which they considered a huge percentage of infrastructure already existed. They believed both those forms of transport could well do with investment, as any regular commuter on either service could testify. They were unsure as to whether another type of rail service to Heathrow would be necessary and questioned whether the money could not be more profitably used, extending and improving the Central, District, Piccadilly, and Metropolitan lines. They also considered that the majority of these lines were, at their extremities, overland, and therefore could be extended and routed at a small fraction of the cost of the Crossrail project. They felt the remaining

monies could then be spent bringing the underground service into the twenty-first century, which they considered would be appreciated by all Londoners.

#### *Petition No. 311 – Robert Wilson MP*

209. The Petitioner understood that Crossrail would be a metro scheme, not a regional commuter scheme, which existed to support the Mayor of London's transport strategy. However, he considered that Crossrail's scope west of London should be much more ambitious. The Petitioner believed that Crossrail should provide a regional service linked to major transport hubs, which would make economic and environmental sense. He felt Crossrail would not serve new and growing population centres, so the projected additional revenues barely covered the projected additional operating costs. He believed a potential nightmare scenario involved more traffic on regional roads outside London as freight would be pushed off the tracks and passengers would decide that they could not and would not accept a slow stopping service.

#### *Petition No. 319 – London Borough of Camden*

210. The Petitioners considered that the nominated undertaker should be required to undertake all works concurrently that impact on the surface, in particular those at Tottenham Court Road station. They were concerned that blight and disruption would be exacerbated if part of the proposals contained in the Bill were postponed for any reason.

#### *Petition No. 321 – Westminster City Council*

211. The Petitioners stated that they remain to be convinced that the proposals set out in the Bill for all engineering and construction activity had been designed to take account fully of the needs of residents and businesses across the Petitioners' City, or that all options had been explored, or that all available mitigation measures were incorporated.

#### *Petition No. 321 – The Spitalfields Small Business Association Ltd*

212. The Petitioners objected to the route proposed for the tunnels via the Hanbury Street shaft and Whitechapel station, east of the safeguarded alignment between Paddington and Liverpool Street. They believed that the route was the 1991 safeguarded route only slightly modified and represented a totally inadequate and ill thought out design solution for tunnels wanting to terminate much further east. The Petitioners believed the proposals did not meet the fundamental design criteria set for the construction of the lines and insufficient consideration had been made of the environmental, social and economic impacts on the Brick Lane area of not digging end to end.

213. The Petitioners did not believe there was a proven need for the Whitechapel station nor the construction of the tunnels from the Hanbury Street and Pedley Street shafts and worksites and considered that all those aspects should be deleted from the Bill.

#### *Petition No. 324 – Shahjalal Community Group*

214. The Petitioners, who form part of the community that was said to benefit from the building and development of Whitechapel Station, requested that the Promoter be asked to

prove that a Crossrail station at Whitechapel was needed in purely transport terms and in the public interest.

*Petition No. 326 – The Residents’ Society of Mayfair and St. James’ and The Grosvenor Mayfair Residents’ Association*

215. The Petitioners felt there had been a campaign to overstate the wider economic benefits which were likely to accrue for Crossrail. The Petitioners considered that there had been no comparable analysis by any economists of the equivalent benefits that emanated from an alternative Crossrail route, Crossrail Northern Interchange Route (CNIR) which in the opinion of the Petitioners and their advisors was likely to be just as good as Crossrail or better. They believed it should have been independently analysed by an agreed independent economist. It was not the intention of the Petitioners to detain Parliament unduly; but it was pointed out that, the previous Opposed Bill Committee members of Parliament, when rejecting the same Crossrail Central London Alignment in May 1994; called for an integrated London rail scheme including direct airport lines. However, no such official planning work had been done. The Petitioners’ advisors had worked out a number of low cost original options which taken together would be far cheaper than Crossrail and some of them should come much before. This involved upgrading existing rail lines and altering them to the minimum. They considered that various tax funding proposals had been made such as development land taxes which had never worked in the past and/or produced little and also local business and domestic tax precepts in London, which would fall upon the entire metropolis, only part of which could benefit from Crossrail and was therefore inequitable. The Petitioners’ advisors pointed out that with an airports related scheme such as CNIR (and their wider proposals) there was a fair and reasonable possibility of an air movements tax which might be a fair trade off with the airline industry.

216. The Petitioners considered that their current proposals concerning the CNIR should have been given proper consideration in the light of the benefits that the Petitioners believed their alternative route would bring compared to the route proposed by the Promoter in the Bill, particularly in view of the fact that London has been awarded the 2012 Olympics which raised issues of potential conflict between the programme management of the Crossrail project and the programme management for the Olympics. The Petitioners believed those benefits included inter alia:- (a) better tube connections, connections to London airports and interchanges, connecting with nearly every London Underground line and helping to relieve congestion on the London Underground system. In particular, approximately £4 billion could be saved. CNIR postulated an approximate overall saving, as against Crossrail, of some 30 percent in capital cost. That did not take account of other benefits from regeneration etc. of areas which need it by deleting several kilometres of disruptive new Crossrail Line between Liverpool Street and Canary Wharf. They felt that this intrusive scheme was very similar to an earlier discarded alignment of the Channel Tunnel Rail Link, which the Select Committees for that Bill wisely ensured was diverted following an East End outcry. That scheme now ran sensibly under the North London railway from Stratford to near St Pancras. The Petitioners considered that Crossrail proposed to repeat this same error and quite unnecessarily. CNIR incorporated a low cost and predominantly surface railway in order to serve Canary Wharf and the Thames Gateway in general. Furthermore, the Petitioners believed that section of CNIR

could be constructed ahead of and to support the 2012 London Olympics. That was primarily because it amounted to a surface railway from Stansted to Stratford, Woolwich and Abbey Wood etc. The only subterranean section would be four tracks in the tunnel under the Thames at Woolwich, replacing plans for three other separate sets of costly Thames tunnels, which would form an all purpose railway including freight. Canary Wharf was served by a short branch on the surface from near Canning Town (in via the back door). The Petitioners believed it would be necessary to re-construct parts of the Docklands Light Railway (DLR) which was a comparatively very cheap option. The Petitioners informed the Promoter of this proposal (with the exception the backdoor branch into Canary Wharf) at the minuted meeting on 12 December 2001, but received no adequate response. Oxford Street was served already by five tube lines and CNIR would enhance: (a) tube interchanges radically (e.g. Portland Place, for tube interchange only) there should be greatly improved travel to and within the West End; (b) less disruption to residents, less environmental impact by tunnelling mostly under roads, parks and the use of the alignment of existing underground sections of railway, less risk to the built heritage including listed buildings and the greater capacity for the movement of tunnelling spoil and construction materials by rail and fewer lorry movements; (c) considerably less expensive than Crossrail with fewer engineering costs and other expenses such as disruption to businesses in Central London through less demolition, lesser risk of settlement, the shortening of the tunnel route in the central section by nearly a kilometre in length and minimising private sector claims and distress thereby resulting in fewer compensation claims; and (d) improved links for rail freight in East London and the Thames Gateway with direct connections to the Channel Tunnel.

217. The Petitioners felt that the CNIR would run along an east-west alignment to the north of the current scheme proposed by the Promoter, running roughly parallel and below the existing Circle and Metropolitan and Hammersmith & City London Underground line with an altered Paddington station and then double-ended stations at Marylebone/Baker Street; Euston/ St. Pancras/Kings Cross; Barbican/Moorgate and Liverpool Street/Bishopsgate. They believed that CNIR would provide a direct rail connection between Terminal 5 to Heathrow Airport and St Pancras for the Channel Tunnel Rail Link (CTRL) and many more improved connections generally with Heathrow and Stansted airports. The Promoter referred to a previous version of the CNIR proposal in Volume 1 of the Environmental Statement (paragraphs 6.3.18 to 6.3.22). However, the Petitioners strongly refuted the Promoter's arguments in that respect particularly as the Petitioners believed that that assessment was based on known to be outdated proposals put by the Residents' Association of Mayfair, the forerunner of one of the Petitioners, the Residents' Society of Mayfair and St. James', in early 1992 which were amended to the Promoter's knowledge with comments by 1993/1994. The Petitioners believed that overall these have since been amended and improved several times and were now represented by the current CNIR proposals as advanced by the Petitioners to CLRL in 2001/2002 and 2004/2005 which addressed any alleged shortcomings of earlier proposals and the Promoter had therefore failed in its statutory duty to conduct either any study or a proper study of the Petitioner's alternative scheme as required under European Law and under the EIA Regulations 1999.

### *Petition No. 328 – The Spitalfields Society*

218. The Petitioners considered that the Promoter should not be permitted by means of the Bill to interfere with private property rights and interests unless, and except to the extent (if any) that, there was no better alternative to the route alignment taking all criteria into account and it could be demonstrated to be necessary for the purposes of the Bill and to be in the public interest. The Petitioners had not been provided with full justification for the proposals in the Bill affecting the Properties and they were not satisfied that it was necessary or expedient for the other powers of the Bill to apply at all or in the manner or to the extent proposed.

### *Petition No. 335 – Garden Properties Ltd and Farnham Properties Ltd; and Petition No. 336 – GMV Three Ltd and GMV Ten Ltd*

219. The Petitioners considered that the nominated undertaker should not be permitted by means of the Bill to interfere with private property, rights and interests unless, and except to the extent (if any) that, this could be demonstrated both to be necessary for the purposes of the Bill and to be in the public interest. The Petitioners had not been provided with any justification for the proposals in the Bill affecting your Petitioners' property. The Petitioners believed that the nominated undertaker should demonstrate and be put to the strictest proof of the need for and desirability of the proposals in the Bill as affecting Petitioners' property and that the limits of deviation of the scheduled works, the resulting powers for the compulsory acquisition of interests in the property, the power to construct works and the exercise of works and ancillary powers within the limits of deviation should be restricted in relation to the Petitioners' property to the extent (if any) to which they could be strictly justified and so as to minimise or prevent interference with that land. In particular, the Petitioners contended that any interest in any of their land acquired by, or on behalf of, the nominated undertaker should be strictly limited both to the immediate needs of Crossrail and as respects any express or implied constraints which may thereby be imposed upon the remainder of your Petitioners' land.

### *Petition No. 341 – Jean Lambert and others*

220. We note that the Petitioners objected to the omission of a railway from Canal Way, Ladbroke Grove to Richmond via Willesden Junction, the South West line and the North London Line; the omission of a railway from Heathrow T5 station west and then north along the old GW Staines branch to rejoin the GWML with a west facing junction near Iver; the omission of a railway from Windsor to Slough; the omission of a railway from Old Oak Common to Uxbridge via South Ruislip and the omission of a railway from Greenford East Junction to West Baling Junction; and the omission of a railway from Romford to Ebbsfleet in Clause 1 and Schedule 1.

221. The Petitioners also objected to the proposal that over half the westbound trains would terminate at Paddington and turn back in sidings at Westbourne Park. They believed it would be a wasted resource as it would not serve west London adequately. They felt other branches should be included to make better use of these trains. The Petitioners proposed new routes improved public transport access in a swath of West London, which included branches to Uxbridge (via South Ruislip), Castle Bar Park (anti-clockwise loop using Greenford branch), Windsor (via Slough) and Richmond (via Willesden Junction

and the North London Line) and were mainly on existing or former railways with short linking spurs. The Petitioners felt that even if those branches were not included in phase 1, provision for them, with appropriate junctions, should be made in phase 1.

222. The Petitioners opposed to the omission of a railway from Windsor to Slough as part of Crossrail as they considered this would take over the existing railway together with a grade separated junction with the Great Western Main Line somewhere between Iver and Slough. They believed that an improved public transport access between Windsor, Heathrow and central London would lead to a reduction in road traffic in the Heathrow area and a reduction in air pollution.

223. The Petitioners also opposed to the omission of a railway from Old Oak Common to Uxbridge via South Ruislip. They considered a Crossrail service on this route would provide improved access to residential areas and the regeneration area at Park Royal. The Petitioners believed it would encourage modal shift from cars to rail and so would benefit the environment. They felt existing railways from Old Oak Common West junction to a new junction near Ruislip Gardens (Wycombe line) and the Metropolitan line from Ickeham to Uxbridge together with a connecting chord located under sidings at the London Underground Central line Ruislip depot would become part of Crossrail.

224. The Petitioners also objected to the omission of a railway from Romford to Ebbsfleet. They felt that there should be a Crossrail line between Romford and Ebbsfleet, connecting together the two branches to the east, to form a loop via a new tunnel under the Thames at Northfleet. The Petitioners believed that this would serve and link parts of Thames Gateway north and south of the river and that even if this loop was not included in phase 1, provision for it, with appropriate junctions, should be made. The loop would use the existing lines between Romford and Upminster and Upminster and Grays.

#### *Petition No. 346 – Laing Homes Ltd*

225. The Petitioner considered that it was not necessary to use their land for the purposes intended when there were other routes available to the Promoter.

#### *Petition No. 349 – George Galloway MP*

226. The Petitioner considered that, in the ordinary course of a project of this sort, it would be currently subject to much more detailed design work than it appeared to have been undertaken. He believed that not only was such detail missing and as such the current scheme and its impact had not been properly analysed and the most appropriate tunnelling methodology, worksites and route alignment had not been chosen taking all criteria including risk assessment, noise, pollution, vibration, environmental harm, traffic levels, health and safety into account but the Petitioner understood that no sufficient budget was available for its progression at this stage.

227. The Petitioner believed the promoter had not produced any evidence to show compliance with NATA, (the Government's New Approach to Transport Appraisal), which assesses five criteria; economy, safety, accessibility, integration and environment.

228. The Petitioner understood that Channel Tunnel Rail Link engineers comprehensively considered alignment alternatives for each section and produced an audit trail justifying their choice of the preferred route. He considered that the promoter had failed to produce any systematic comparisons of alternatives and also failed to provide adequate reasons for this failure given the likely impact on the Spitalfields area.

229. The Petitioner also considered that the inclusion of the Whitechapel Station was premature given the confusion over the statement of the principle of the intermediate stations until the full information in relation to its inclusion had been provided. Hence in his opinion, the case for the inclusion of Whitechapel Station was unproven.

### *Petition No. 349 – Annetta Pedretti*

230. The Petitioner believed that the curve in the tunnel directly to the east of Liverpool Street Station was ill-considered and that it would be premature and counter-productive to provide an unspecified undertaker with powers to carry out works whilst this remained unproven.

231. The Petitioner suggested that the scheme be subjected to the rigorous scrutiny of an independent, internationally informed and interdisciplinary design process and scrutinised in a public forum, with a view to the development of a clear and sustainable design brief with socially responsible design guidelines.

232. The Petitioner considered that Whitechapel Station was added to the scheme at the insistence of their local council to ‘put the area on the map’ for alleged ‘regeneration’ benefits. She did not believe that a station at Whitechapel was in the best interest of an effective rail link or for the benefit of ‘regenerating’ Whitechapel.

### *Petition No. 357 – Spitalfields Housing Association*

233. The Petitioners objected to the route proposed for the tunnels via the Hanbury Street shaft and Whitechapel station, east of the safeguarded alignment between Paddington and Liverpool Street. They thought the route appeared to be merely a modification of the 1991 safeguarded route, which represented a totally inadequate and ill-considered design solution for tunnels which would now terminate much further east. They believed that even though the proposals did not meet fundamental design criteria set for construction of the lines, insufficient consideration appeared to have been given to alternative solutions. They felt that a specialist tunnel engineering report produced on behalf of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets endorsed the fact that a more rigorous analysis of the route would suggest that the best solution was to construct the tunnel end to end.

### *Petition No. 359 – Mr John Payne*

234. The Petitioner objected to the Bill as he believed a better route for the Central section linking the stations at Paddington and Farringdon would be via the mainline railway stations of Marylebone, Euston and St. Pancras.

## Issues raised in petitions deposited against the third set of Additional Provisions relating to Environmental Impact

### *Petition No. 6 – Spitalfields Community Association; and Petition No. 6 – Woodseer and Hanbury Residents Association*

235. The Petitioners considered that the Promoter's present choice for the tunnel alignment going under the Spitalfields area was wrong. The Petitioners believed that the main reasons and considerations were absent and the available information showed they were not for the purposes of building a successful railway scheme or in the wider public interest. The Petitioners also believed that the southerly route was possible and had been discounted without good reason. The Petitioners required the Promoter to provide a more detailed and comprehensive comparative assessment of the need for tunnelling under Spitalfields. The Petitioners sought proper consideration of a southerly route.

236. The Petitioners did not believe the Promoter had justified the need for Whitechapel Station in relation to the Crossrail scheme. They considered the case for Whitechapel Station was unproven for the Petitioners and taxpayers alike. They also believed they would be adversely affected by the proposal and taxpayers would pay more than £400 million for a station that was considered unnecessary. They felt the Promoter had been inconsistent in its approach to this scheme.

### *Petition No. 12 – Mr John Payne*

237. The Petitioner considered that a better alignment for the Central section would link the stations at Paddington and Tottenham Court Road via the Edgware Road and Bond Street/Cavendish Square/Oxford Circus, which would avoid the Petitioner's property. The change in alignment, the Petitioner believed, would save billions of pounds in costs and would make further large savings and improvements at Farringdon and Liverpool Street Station.

### *Petition No. 12 – Leo F. Walters*

238. The Petitioner objected to the Bill and the scheme amendments proposed by Crossrail and published on the 15 November 2006. He felt that there were better arrangements and amendments which should be considered. In particular, the Petitioner believed extensions of works north of Oxford Street by Crossrail pointed to an obvious reconsideration of the superior, sound and less intrusive scheme which took the Bond Street station alignment a very short distance north of Oxford Street, under Wigmore Street and in particular with a full connection to Oxford Circus underground station which would recycle the major 'brown-field' site of the publicly owned Cavendish Square underground car park.

### **Further issues**

239. We further note that two issues have arisen before us in the context of environmental assessment concerning either: the alleged inadequacy generally of the environmental assessment process for the Bill and the Environmental Statements produced for Crossrail,

and the failure to consider alternatives. A number of Petitioners have sought to argue that Crossrail had not adequately considered the alternatives to the current proposals.<sup>41</sup> We have been frequently assured by Counsel to the Promoter that what has been produced in the Environmental Statement meets the legal requirements of providing an outline of the main alternatives studied by the developer and an indication of the main reasons for this choice, taking into account the environmental effects. We understand that there was no requirement to set out full information on alternatives. We note that the main alternative study was summarised in chapter six of the main Environmental Statement deposited in February 2005.

240. The Promoter also told us that the environmental assessment process adopted for the Bill complies with the Environmental Assessments Directive and we see no reason to dispute their conclusions.

241. We are content that the Bill should proceed through the House and that the information provided in the Environmental Statements, together with that obtained from the public through the consultation process on the Environmental Statements, will form part of the information to be taken into account by Parliament. We conclude that the Environmental Impact Assessment process has been conducted in what we are advised is a suitable and reasonable manner and we understand that it has therefore met the relevant requirement of the Directive under European law.<sup>42</sup>

---

41 Paragraph 21423 [Mr D Elvin QC]

42 Ibid.

## 11 Conclusion – the future of the project

---

242. The Government and the business community have agreed that there is a need for a scheme such as Crossrail. Although the Crossrail project has enjoyed support from most of London's politicians and business community, it has been continually delayed by wrangling over finance. The Prime Minister gave Crossrail the green light with a £16 billion funding deal to secure the construction of the project on 5 October 2007. We were told that Crossrail would be funded by the Government, the private sector and Crossrail fare payers, the cost being shared equitably amongst them. The Promoter intends to continue to steer the Bill through Parliament so that a single programme of construction can begin in earnest in 2010, with an expectation that the first services on the railway will begin to run on schedule in 2017.

243. Crossrail has long been in the background of the capital's transportation development plans. Even before construction begins this scheme has blighted the homes of hundreds of people living on the proposed route. Londoners desperately need a new transport system and it is hoped that Crossrail will be able to deliver one.

**244. During the last 22 months we have become immersed in the intricate detail of this complicated piece of legislation. Whilst we are now aware of the extensive information available describing the Crossrail scheme and its expected impacts, we remain concerned that members of the public may struggle to locate information that is relevant to them. Every person affected by the Crossrail Bill has the right to understand what it will mean for them and their area. The Promoters must take steps now and at every stage of this process to ensure that information provided to the public is clear, accessible and comprehensive.**

## 12 Annex A: Instructions

---

### House of Commons Votes and Proceedings Tuesday 19th July 2005

2 Crossrail Bill,—Ordered, That S.O. 209(1) of the Standing Orders relating to Private Business (time for delivering notices, etc.) shall have effect in relation to the deposit of Petitions in connection with the Crossrail Bill on or before 16th September 2005 as if on a day on which the House does not sit deposit were required to be made between 11.00 a.m. and 3.00 p.m.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

15 Crossrail Bill,—The Order of the day being read, for the Second Reading of the Crossrail Bill;

And a Motion being made, and the Question being put, That the Bill be now read a second time;

The House divided.

Tellers for the Ayes, Mr Ian Cawsey, Tony Cunningham: 394.

Tellers for the Noes, Andrew Rosindell, Mr Mark Lancaster: 24.

So the Question was agreed to. The Bill was accordingly read a second time.

16 Crossrail Bill [Money],—Her Majesty's Recommendation having been signified to the proposed Motion relating to Crossrail Bill [Money];

A Motion was made, and the Question being put forthwith, pursuant to Standing Order No. 52 (Money resolutions and ways and means resolutions in connection with bills), That, for the purposes of any Act resulting from the Crossrail Bill, it is expedient to authorise the payment out of money provided by Parliament of—

(a) any expenditure incurred by the Secretary of State in consequence of the Act, and

(b) any increase attributable to the Act in the sums payable out of money so provided under any other enactment—(*Mr Vernon Coaker*):—It was agreed to.

17 Crossrail Bill [Ways and Means],—A Motion was made, and the Question being put forthwith, pursuant to Standing Order No. 52 (Money resolutions and ways and means resolutions in connection with bills), That, for the purposes of any Act resulting from the Crossrail Bill, it is expedient to authorise the making of provision about income tax, corporation tax, capital gains tax, stamp duty, stamp duty land tax and stamp duty reserve tax—(*Mr Vernon Coaker*):—It was agreed to.

18 Crossrail Bill [Select Committee],—A Motion was made, and the Question being put forthwith, pursuant to Order [this day], That the Bill be committed to a Select Committee of ten Members to be nominated by the Committee of Selection.

That there shall stand referred to the Select Committee—

(a) any Petition against the Bill presented by being deposited in the Private Bill Office at any time not later than 16th September 2005, and

(b) any Petition which has been presented by being deposited in the Private Bill Office and in which the Petitioners complain of any amendment as proposed in the filled-up Bill or of any matter which has arisen during the progress of the Bill before the Select Committee, being a Petition in which the Petitioners pray to be heard by themselves, their Counsel or Agents.

That, notwithstanding the practice of the House that appearances on Petitions against an opposed Private Bill be required to be entered at the first meeting of the Select Committee on the Bill, in the case of any such Petitions as are mentioned in sub-paragraph (a) above on which appearances are not entered at that meeting, the Select Committee shall appoint a later day on which it will require appearances on those Petitions to be entered.

That any Petitioner whose Petition stands referred to the Select Committee shall, subject to the Rules and Orders of the House and to the Prayer of his Petition, be entitled to be heard by himself, his Counsel or Agents upon his Petition provided that it is prepared and signed in conformity with the Rules and Orders of the House, and the Member in charge of the Bill shall be entitled to be heard by his Counsel or Agents in favour of the Bill against that Petition.

That the Select Committee have power to sit notwithstanding any adjournment of the House, to adjourn from place to place and to report from day to day the Minutes of Evidence taken before it.

That three be the Quorum of the Select Committee—(*Mr Vernon Coaker*):—It was agreed to.

19 Crossrail Bill [Instruction],—A Motion was made, and the Question being put forthwith, pursuant to Order [this day], That it be an Instruction to the Select Committee to which the Crossrail Bill is committed—

(a) that the Select Committee, without comment, report to the House for its consideration any issue relating to the environmental impact of the railway transport system for which the Bill provides that is raised in a Petition against the Bill, but which the Select Committee is prevented from considering by the practice of the House; and

(b) that, in applying the practice of the House, the Select Committee treat the principle of the Bill as including—

(i) the termini of the railway transport system for which the Bill provides, and

(ii) the provision of intermediate stations at Paddington, Bond Street, Tottenham Court Road, Farringdon, Liverpool Street, Whitechapel, the Isle of Dogs and Custom House—(*Mr Vernon Coaker*);

The House divided.

Tellers for the Ayes, Tony Cunningham, Mr Ian Cawsey: 311.

Tellers for the Noes, Andrew Selous, Mr Henry Bellingham: 114.

### House of Commons Votes and Proceedings Thursday 12th January 2006

Crossrail Bill [Instruction] (No. 2),—A Motion was made, and the Question being put, That it be a further Instruction to the Select Committee to which the Crossrail Bill is committed—

(1) that it have power to consider—

(a) the extension of permitted development under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 in relation to development which is the subject of environmental assessment in connection with the Bill;

(b) additional power to carry out works for the purpose of reinstating facilities whose operation or use is discontinued because of the exercise of powers conferred by the Bill;

(c) provision relating to the abstraction of water;

(d) alterations to the provision which is now made in the Bill regarding planning permission for development authorised by the Bill which consists of a work other than a scheduled work;

(e) alterations to the provision which is now made in the Bill regarding the application of provisions of the Bill to things authorised by an order under section 1 of the Transport and Works Act 1992;

(f) alterations to the provision which is now made in the Bill regarding any of the following—

(i) a crossover at Farringdon;

(ii) sidings at Westbourne Park;

(iii) diversion of the Moorgate Station Sewer;

(iv) a jetty and conveyor at West India Docks South;

(v) use of the River Lea for barge loading and holding areas;

(vi) realignment of the Docklands Light Railway at Custom House;

(vii) facilities for handling excavated materials at Manor Wharf;

(viii) a shaft at Eleanor Street;

(ix) diversion of the Hackney to Abbey Mills Sewer and the Wick Lane Sewer;

(x) a bridge over Hollow Hill Lane, Langley;

(g) realignment of the proposed running tunnel beneath Shorts Gardens, Camden;

(h) alterations to a ticket hall at the proposed Whitechapel Station;

(i) alterations to the provision which is now made in the Bill regarding approval in relation to highway accesses;

(j) alterations to the provision which is now made in the Bill regarding the acquisition of land at Basin Approach, Lowell Street and land at Billingsgate Market;

(k) alterations to the provision which is now made in the Bill regarding the creation and acquisition

of easements or other rights over land;

(l) alterations to the table in paragraph 1 of Schedule 8 to the Bill (disapplication and modification of heritage controls), so far as relating to the City of Westminster, the City of London and the London Borough of Tower Hamlets;

(m) the inclusion of additional land within the limits of land to be acquired or used;

and, if it thinks fit, to make amendments to the Bill with respect to any of the matters mentioned above, and for connected purposes;

(2) that any Petition against Amendments to the Bill which the Select Committee to which the Crossrail Bill is committed is empowered to make shall be referred to that Select Committee if—

(a) it is presented by being deposited in the Private Bill Office not later than the end of the period of four weeks beginning with the day on which the first newspaper notice of the Amendments was published or, if that period includes any time during which the House is adjourned for more than four days, not later than five weeks beginning with that day, and

(b) it is one in which the Petitioners pray to be heard by themselves, their Counsel or Agents.

That these Orders be Standing Orders of the House.—(*Mr Secretary Darling.*)

The House divided.

Tellers for the Ayes, Gillian Merron, Mr Ian Cawsey: 390.

Tellers for the Noes, Mr Peter Kilfoyle, Mr George Howarth: 0.

So the Question was agreed to. It being two hours after the commencement of proceedings on the Motions relating to the Crossrail Bill, the Deputy Speaker put the Questions necessary to dispose of proceedings on the remaining Motions, pursuant to Order [19th December].

2 Crossrail Bill [Instruction] (No. 3),—Ordered, That it be a further Instruction to the Select Committee to which the Crossrail Bill is committed that, where a Petition against the Bill which stands referred to the Select Committee raises an issue regarding extension of the railway transport system for which the Bill provides—

(a) from Maidenhead to Reading, or

(b) from Abbey Wood to Ebbsfleet,

it may, if it thinks it appropriate to do so, hear the Petitioner and the Member in charge of the Bill on that issue for the purpose of reporting to the House whether there appears to be a case for such extension being the subject of an application for an order under the Transport and Works Act 1992.

That where the Select Committee to which the Crossrail Bill is committed decides under this instruction to hear the Petitioner and the Member in charge of the Bill on an issue, the Petitioner shall be entitled to be heard by himself, his Counsel or Agents and the Member in charge of the Bill shall be entitled to be heard by his Counsel or Agents.

That these Orders be Standing Orders of the House.—(*Mr Frank Roy.*)

### House of Commons Votes and Proceedings - Tuesday 31st October 2006

Crossrail Bill [Instruction] (No. 4),—Ordered, That it be a further Instruction to the Select Committee to which the Crossrail Bill is committed in the next Session—

- (1) that it have power to consider—
  - (a) provision in connection with the reinstatement of facilities whose operation or use is discontinued because of the exercise of power conferred by the Bill;
  - (b) provision in connection with agreements relating to temporary possession and use of land subject to compulsory acquisition;
  - (c) provision in connection with prohibitions of or restrictions on the use of land imposed for purposes connected with Crossrail;
  - (d) alterations to the provision which is now made in the Bill regarding works at West Drayton Yard, London Borough of Hillingdon;
  - (e) works at Old Oak Common Depot, Ilford Depot and North Pole Depot, including realignment of the railway between Old Oak Common and Ladbroke Grove;
  - (f) realignment of the railway between Westbourne Park and Royal Oak;
  - (g) the footbridge at Westbourne Park;
  - (h) the lowering of Eastbourne Terrace and Chilworth Street, City of Westminster;
  - (i) alterations to the provision which is now made in the Bill regarding the acquisition of land at Hanover Square, City of Westminster;
  - (j) extension of the limits of deviation at Hanover Square, City of Westminster and at Charterhouse Square, Lindsey Street, Hayne Street and Long Lane, City of London;
  - (k) an additional ticket hall and other works at Bond Street Station;
  - (l) the construction of the works at Tottenham Court Road Station;
  - (m) alterations to the provision which is now made in the Bill regarding a shaft at Fox and Knot Street, London Borough of Islington;
  - (n) an additional ticket hall and enhancement of the existing ticket hall at Liverpool Street Station;
  - (o) the vertical alignment of the running tunnel beneath Stepney Green, London Borough of Tower Hamlets;
  - (p) a train reversing facility at West Ham;
  - (q) a barge loading facility at Instone Wharf, London Boroughs of Newham and Tower Hamlets, including a conveyor for construction purposes;
  - (r) alterations to the proposed Isle of Dogs Station;
  - (s) alterations to the tables in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Schedule No. 8 to the Bill (disapplication and modification of heritage controls);

and, if it thinks fit, to make amendments to the Bill with respect to any of the matters mentioned above, and for connected purposes;

(2) that any Petition against Amendments to the Bill which the Select Committee mentioned in paragraph (1) above is empowered by that paragraph to make shall be referred to that Select Committee if—

(a) it is presented by being deposited in the Private Bill Office not later than the end of the period of four weeks beginning with the day on which the first newspaper notice of the Amendments was published or, if that period includes any time during which the House is adjourned, or prorogued, for more than four days, not later than five weeks beginning with that day, and

(b) it is one in which the Petitioners pray to be heard by themselves, their Counsel or Agents;

(3) that, in its application to Amendments of which the first newspaper notice is published after the date of this Instruction, paragraph 2(a) of Instruction (No. 2) [12th January] shall have effect with the insertion after ‘is adjourned’ of ‘, or prorogued,’.

That these Orders be Standing Orders of the House.—(*Mr Tom Harris.*)

#### **House of Commons Votes and Proceedings Wednesday 25th April 2007**

5 Crossrail Bill [Instruction] (No. 5),—Ordered, That it be a further Instruction to the Select Committee to which the Crossrail Bill is committed—

(1) that it have power to consider—

(a) the provision of a station at Woolwich, in the London Borough of Greenwich;

(b) realignment of the running tunnels at or in the vicinity of the proposed Woolwich Station;

(c) works associated with the realignment mentioned in paragraph (b) above:

and, if it thinks fit, to make amendments to the Bill with respect to any of the matters mentioned above, and for connected purposes;

(2) that any Petition against Amendments to the Bill which the Select Committee to which the Crossrail Bill is committed is empowered by paragraph (1) above to make shall be referred to that Select Committee if—

(a) it is presented by being deposited in the Private Bill Office not later than the end of the period of four weeks beginning with the day on which the first newspaper notice of the Amendments was published or, if that period ends on a day on which the House does not sit, not later than the fifth day on which the House next sits, and

(b) it is one in which the Petitioners pray to be heard by themselves, their Counsel or Agents.

(3) that, in their application to Amendments of which the first newspaper notice is published after the date of this Instruction, paragraph 2(a) of Instruction (No. 2) [12th January 2006] and paragraph 2(a) of Instruction (No. 4) [31st October 2006] shall have effect as if for the words from ‘that period’ to the end there were substituted ‘ends on a day on which the House does not sit, not later than the fifth day on which the House next sits’.

That these Orders be Standing Orders of the House.—(*Mr Tom Harris.*)

## 13 Annex B: Committee Visits

---

During the inquiry the Committee made seven visits to inspect a variety of sites on the proposed Crossrail Route. The Committee welcomed the participation of Petitioners, relevant experts and Crossrail representatives. At each location we were given an overview of the particular issues that had been raised by Petitioners, together with construction methodology.

A recurrent issue from many Petitioners was the question of noise levels in relation to the construction and the running of a railway, insofar as what levels of noise would be acceptable or not, together with what could be achieved, and what could not. Therefore, in addition to these visits, the Committee attended a noise tutorial organised by Mr Rupert Thornely-Taylor at the London Underground offices at 55 Broadway, London. The Committee experienced the sorts of noise and noise attenuation that would be expected on construction sites today.

### Liverpool Street to Farringdon 19 January 2006

Mr Alan Meale	Kelvin Hopkins
Mr Brian Binley	Mrs Siân C. James
Ms Katy Clark	Mr Ian Liddell-Grainger
Mr Philip Hollobone	Sir Peter Soulsby

The visit to Liverpool Street was timed to coincide with the 0845-0900 period to allow the Committee to understand the level of congestion at the busiest time. The visit enabled the Committee to have an overview of the proposed works at Liverpool Street Station and Moorgate Station and the potential effects on the current mainline and underground stations, including an indication of siting of the proposed western ticket hall. The Committee were shown how the surrounding surface vicinity would be affected by the proposed works.

We then visited Farringdon to understand the impact of a station on the surrounding area, including Charterhouse Street, Hayne Street, Long Lane and Lindsey Street to the East of Smithfield market and the site of Cardinal House at the junction of Farringdon Road and Cowcross Street to the West.

### Tottenham Court Road to Hyde Park 14 February 2006

Mr Alan Meale	Mrs Siân C. James
Mr Brian Binley	Mr Ian Liddell-Grainger
Ms Katy Clark	Mrs Linda Riordan
Mr Philip Hollobone	Sir Peter Soulsby
Kelvin Hopkins	

The Committee were shown the proposed site of an emergency ventilation and intervention site at Fisher Street, WC1. They were then taken to the Astoria Site, bounded by Oxford Street, Charing Cross Road, Sutton Row and Falconberg Court, where the eastern ticket hall of proposed Tottenham Court Road Station would be located. Following this the Committee visited the premises of the British Board of Film Classification, a Petitioner against the Bill, before viewing the site of the Fareham Street ventilation shaft together with the western ticket hall site.

The Committee were then taken to the proposed site of Bond Street Station which would lie approximately 100 metres south of Oxford Street. We were shown the site of 18/19 Hanover Square which would accommodate the eastern ticket hall of Bond Street Station and the ventilation and emergency escape on Tenterden Street. We were then shown the location of the proposed western ticket hall which would occupy the block bounded by Davies Street, St. Anselm's Place, Gilbert Street and Weighhouse Street (the entrance being on the corner of Davies Street and Weighhouse Street).

We were then driven to two further locations at Park Lane and to Bayswater Road at Lancaster Gate, to enable the Committee to have an overview of the ventilation and emergency shafts proposed in the central reservation of Park Lane and at Hyde Park.

### **Whitechapel and Hanbury Street 23 May 2006**

Mr Alan Meale  
Kelvin Hopkins  
Mr Ian Liddell-Grainger

Mrs Linda Riordan  
Sir Peter Soulsby

The Committee went on a site visit to Whitechapel. The Committee were given a tour of the London Underground station and were shown how Crossrail would interchange with the current District and East London Lines. We were shown the locations of the proposed eastern and western ticket halls, at Cambridge Heath Road and Fulbourne Street respectively. The Committee went to Durward Street to see where the proposed ventilation and escape shaft would be and visited Swanlea School and Kempton Court, the premises of two of the Petitioners within the area to witness how they would be affected by the proposals.

The Committee were then taken to the proposed site of the Hanbury Street Shaft where emergency access and ventilation would be provided. We were shown the area bounded by Princelet Street, Spelman Street, Greatorex Street and Hanbury Street and the proposed route of lorries travelling east of the site which would remove the excavated material.

**Paddington  
20 June 2006**

Ms Katy Clark  
Mr Philip Hollobone  
Kelvin Hopkins

Mrs Siân C. James  
Mr Ian Liddell-Grainger  
John Pugh

The Committee's visit to Paddington Station included a tour of various features of the station that would be affected by the Crossrail Bill, including The Lawn, the Clock and Horse Arches, and Platforms 1 and 12. We were shown where the Crossrail Station would be constructed beneath Eastbourne Terrace. The Committee were shown potential impact of works in respect of Praed Street, London Street, Bishop's Bridge Road, the Triangle and Canalside and Westbourne Terrace.

The Committee then visited the proposed site of the Royal Oak Portal, where Crossrail's tunnels would surface and join with the existing tracks before the service continued west. The Committee toured the Royal Oak worksite and portal site and were shown the location of the permanent turnback facility at Westbourne Park in relation to the external bus parking facility, the concrete batching plant, Paddington New Yard, the Alfred Road Academy site and the connecting footbridge where it crossed the Great Western Main Line.

**Woolwich  
19 October 2006**

Mr Alan Meale  
Ms Katy Clark  
Kelvin Hopkins  
Mrs Siân C. James

Mr Ian Liddell-Grainger  
John Pugh  
Mrs Linda Riordan  
Sir Peter Soulsby

The Committee were first shown Warren Lane Shaft, a ventilation and intervention shaft, just south of the River Thames. We were then taken to the proposed Crossrail station at the former Royal Arsenal West site where we were shown the ventilation shafts and possible station entrances on the north and south sides of Plumstead Road. The Committee were then shown the proximity of the proposed Docklands Light Railway station and the town centre to the proposed site.

**Bond Street, Paddington and Old Oak Common  
22 February 2007**

Mr Alan Meale  
Kelvin Hopkins

Mrs Siân C. James

The Committee visited Bond Street during the 0845-0900 period to understand the level of congestion together with the passenger flow currently experienced between the Bakerloo, Central and Jubilee lines. We were shown the premises of GE Pensions Ltd at 354 to 358 Oxford Street and 1 Marylebone Lane which Crossrail had proposed for compulsory acquisition for the construction of a new London Underground ticket hall and to assist in the congestion relief of Bond Street Station.

The Committee then visited the residential block at Brewers Court at Paddington to note its proximity to the potential noise impact of works at 4-18 Bishop's Bridge Road which would be demolished and where a service deck would be constructed.

We then visited Old Oak Common in west London where it was proposed to locate the main Crossrail depot, instead of at Romford as originally stated in the Bill provisions. The Committee were also shown the North Pole depot where it was proposed that English Welsh and Scottish Railway Limited could be relocated from the Old Oak Common depot.

**Isle of Dogs  
8 March 2007**

Mr Alan Meale  
Kelvin Hopkins

Mrs Linda Riordan

The Committee visited Poplar Dock which would be affected by the impact of works at the Isle of Dogs. We shown around the Poplar Dock, home to the Poplar Dock Boat Owners Association who petitioned the Bill.

The Committee were then taken to see the site of the proposed Isle of Dogs Station and were shown the locations of the eastern and western ticket halls.

We were then taken to the Canary Wharf Group Ltd marketing suite at 1 Canada Square to view the surrounding area to understand the impact of the works at the Isle of Dogs.

## Formal minutes

---

### Tuesday 16 October 2007

Members present:

Mr Alan Meale, in the Chair

Mr Brian Binley	Mr Ian Liddell-Grainger
Mr Philip Hollobone	John Pugh
Kelvin Hopkins	Mrs Linda Riordan
Mrs Siân C. James	Sir Peter Soulsby

Crossrail Bill: The Committee considered this matter.

Draft Special Report (*Crossrail Bill*), proposed by the Chairman, brought up and read.

*Ordered* That the draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 243 read and agreed to.

*Ordered*, That further consideration of the Chairman's draft Report be now adjourned.—  
(*The Chairman.*)

Report to be further considered on Thursday 18 October.

[Adjourned till Thursday 18 October at 4p.m.]

### Thursday 18 October 2007

Members present:

Mr Philip Hollobone	Mr Ian Liddell-Grainger
Mr Kelvin Hopkins	Sir Peter Soulsby

In the absence of the Chairman, Sir Peter Soulsby was called to the Chair.

Consideration of the Chairman's draft Report resumed.

Paragraph 244 read and agreed to.

Annexes A and B and Summary agreed to.

*Resolved*, That the Report be the First Special Report of the Committee to the House.

*Ordered*, That the Chairman do make the Report to the House.

[The Committee adjourned.]

# Petitioners against the Crossrail Bill

---

## Wednesday 18 January 2006

The Petition of Corporation of London with British Land Ev 20

## Thursday 19 January 2006

The Petition of Corporation of London with British Land Ev 50

## Tuesday 24 January 2006

The Petition of Corporation of London with British Land Ev 64

## Wednesday 25 January 2006

The Petitions of Corporation of London with British Land Ev 106

## Thursday 26 January 2006

The Petition of Corporation of London with British Land Ev 137

## Tuesday 31 January 2006

The Petition of Corporation of London with British Land Ev 174

London Fish Merchants Ev 196

## Wednesday 1 February 2006

The Petitions of Robert McCracken; and Covent Garden Community Association Ev 216

## Tuesday 7 February 2006

The Petition of London Borough of Islington Ev 246

## Wednesday 8 February 2006

The Petition of London Borough of Camden Ev 280

## Thursday 9 February 2006

The Petition of London Borough of Camden Ev 311

## Wednesday 15 February 2006

The Petition of City of Westminster Ev 322

**Tuesday 28 February 2006**

The Petition of Smithfield Market Tenants' Association Ev 353

**Wednesday 1 March 2006**

The Petition of Smithfield Market Tenants' Association Ev 385

**Thursday 9 March 2006**

The Petition of Springdene Ltd Ev 392

The Petitions of The Stafford Partnership and Mercury Theatres Ltd Ev 409

**Tuesday 14 March 2006**

The Petition of London Borough of Islington Ev 418

The Petition of Confederation of British Industry Ev 420

**Wednesday 15 March 2006**

The Petition of British Land Ev 446

The Petition of Salisbury House Offices Limited Ev 449

**Tuesday 21 March 2006**

The Petition of EMI Music Publishing Limited Ev 452

**Thursday 23 March 2006**

The Petition of British Board of Film Classification Ev 478

The Petitions of Grand Central Sound Studios Limited Ev 515

**Tuesday 28 March 2006**

The Petition of Petitioners in Brentwood Ev 520

**Wednesday 29 March 2006**

The Petition of Petitioners in Brentwood Ev 558

The Petition of Brentwood Borough Council Ev 567

**Thursday 30 March 2006**

The Petition of Brentwood Borough Council	Ev 596
The Petition of Ms I L Meldal-Johnsen	Ev 603
The Petition of Mr L Walters	Ev 608
The Petition of George Iacobescu and others	Ev 611
The Petition of Mintel International Group Ltd	Ev 614
The Petition of The Residents' Society of Mayfair and St. James' and The Grosvenor Mayfair Residents' Association	Ev 633

**Tuesday 18 April 2006**

The Petition of The Residents' Society of Mayfair and St. James' and The Grosvenor Mayfair Residents' Association	Ev 638
---	--------

**Wednesday 19 April 2006**

The Petition of London Borough of Havering (other than Romford depot issue)	Ev 663
---	--------

**Thursday 20 April 2006**

The Petition of London Borough of Havering (other than Romford depot issue)	Ev 698
---	--------

**Tuesday 2 May 2006**

The Petition of London Borough of Newham	Ev 725
--	--------

**Tuesday 9 May 2006**

The Petition of Jonathan & Angela King	Ev 727
The Petition of London Borough of Greenwich	Ev 732

**Wednesday 10 May 2006**

The Petition of London Borough of Greenwich	Ev 766
---	--------

**Thursday 11 May 2006**

The Petition of London Borough of Greenwich	Ev 794
---	--------

**Tuesday 16 May 2006**

The Petition of London Borough of Bexley	Ev 801
The Petitions of David Waterman; I Waterman (Box Makers) Ltd; The AA Waterman Trust; Alberon Securities Ltd; Executor of A A Waterman; and Trustees of I Waterman Pension Fund	Ev 832
The Petition of Gareth Pearce	Ev 836
The Petition of James Middleton	Ev 838

**Wednesday 17 May 2006**

The Petition of Ferrotec (UK) Limited	Ev 843
---------------------------------------	--------

**Thursday 18 May 2006**

The Petition of The Reverend Christopher Burke	Ev 859
--	--------

**Tuesday 23 May 2006**

The Petitions of Kempton Court Residents Committee and others	Ev 867
The Petition of Southend Arterial Road Action Group	Ev 878

**Wednesday 24 May 2006**

The Petition of Governing Body of Swanlea School	Ev 884
The Petition of East London Line Group	Ev 892
The Petition of Wan & Pang Ltd (The Tai Pan)	Ev 895

**Tuesday 6 June 2006**

The Petition of LA 21 Traffic and Transport Group	Ev 899
---	--------

**Wednesday 7 June 2006**

The Petition of London Borough of Tower Hamlets	Ev 900
---	--------

**Tuesday 13 June 2006**

The Petition of Dr Annetta Pedretti	Ev 930
The Petition of The Spitalfields Society	Ev 934
The Petitions of Dr Annetta Pedretti; and The Spitalfields Society	Ev 957
The Petitions of Fiona Atkins and others; R and P Adams; and N and M Symons;	Ev 961
The Petitions of Huguenot Court Ltd; and Mark and Suzanne Lancaster	Ev 961
The Petition of Panyotis Cleovoulou and others	Ev 964
The Petition of Robin Tutty and others	Ev 966
The Petition of H J and S F Critchley	Ev 968
The Petition of Shahjalal Community Group	Ev 970

**Wednesday 14 June 2006**

The Petition of Friends of Mile End Park	Ev 973
The Petitions of The Spitalfields Trust; J Akker & E Hill; Oliver Theis and others; and Ali Nehru and others;	Ev 978
The Petition of The Spitalfields Practice	Ev 996
The Petitions of Alistair and Eleanor Ferguson; Eleanor Ferguson; Gerald Collins and Mona Hatoum; and Caroline Hamilton	Ev 998
The Petition of George Galloway MP	Ev 1001

**Thursday 15 June 2006**

The Petition of Spitalfields Festival Ltd	Ev 1017
The Petition of The Spitalfields Centre	Ev 1022
The Petition of The Spitalfields Community Association	Ev 1035
The Petition of Spitalfields Housing Association	Ev 1050
The Petition of Patricia Jones:	Ev 1055

**Tuesday 20 June 2006**

The Petition of the Spitalfields Historic Buildings Trust	Ev 1060
The Petition of Christchurch PCC	Ev 1064
The Petition of Jemima Broadbridge	Ev 1066
The Petition of Thomas Sparks and Susan Goodbody	Ev 1069
The Petition of Spitalfields Small Business Association Ltd	Ev 1071
The Petition of Guy Carpenter	Ev 1082
The Petition of Woodseer & Hanbury Residents Association	Ev 1088

**Wednesday 21 June 2006**

The Petition of Westminster City Council	Ev 1093
The Petitions of Paddington Residents Active Concern on Transport; Rodney Fitzgerald; and Katie Black and John Shepherd and others	Ev 1125

**Thursday 22 June 2006**

The Petition of Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea	Ev 1138
---	---------

**Tuesday 27 June 2006**

The Petition of Maidenhead Civic Society and others	Ev 1160
The Petition of Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Ev 1176
The Petition of Thames Reach Residents Association	Ev 1194
The Petition of Westbourne Park Villas Residents Association	Ev 1197

**Wednesday 28 June 2006**

The Petition of Theresa May MP	Ev 1212
The Petition of The Association of Councils of the Thames Valley Region	Ev 1220
The Petition of The East of England Regional Assembly	Ev 1227
The Petitions of Jean Lambert MEP and others	Ev 1241

**Thursday 29 June 2006**

The Petition of Corporation of London and British Land	Ev 1246
--	---------

**Tuesday 4 July 2006**

The Petitions of Association of Train Operating Companies; and London Eastern Railway Ltd, C2C Rail Ltd, Silverlink Train Services Ltd	Ev 1310
The Petition of South East England Regional Assembly	Ev 1319
The Petition of The South West Regional Assembly	Ev 1321

**Wednesday 5 July 2006**

The Petition of Robert Wilson MP	Ev 1327
The Petitions of Martin Salter MP and The Reading Evening Post	Ev 1331
The Petition of Thames Valley Chamber of Commerce Group	Ev 1341
The Petition of Frank Browne	Ev 1344
The Petition of Thames Gateway London Partnership	Ev 1349

**Thursday 6 July 2006**

The Petition of Rail Freight Group	Ev 1359
The Petition of Freight Transport Association Ltd	Ev 1363
The Petition of Tarmac Ltd	Ev 1368

**Tuesday 11 July 2006**

The Petition of Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd	Ev 1378
The Petition of English Welsh & Scottish Railway Ltd	Ev 1383

**Wednesday 12 July 2006**

The Petition of Freightliner Group Ltd;	Ev 1433
The Petitions of Aggregate Industries (UK) Ltd; Plasmor Ltd; and London Concrete Ltd	Ev 1449
The Petition of The Quarry Products Association Ltd	Ev 1450
The Petition of London Thames Gateway Forum	Ev 1459

**Thursday 12 July 2006**

The Petitions of Hutchinson Ports (UK) Limited (HPUK), the Felixstowe Dock and Railway Co, Harwich International Port Ltd and Maritime Transport Services Ltd	Ev 1465
The Petition of Maersk Co Ltd	Ev 1483
The Petition of the ExCel Centre.	Ev 1486
The Petitions of Mendip Rail Ltd	Ev 1505

**Wednesday 18 July 2006**

The Petitions of Mendip Rail Ltd	Ev 1509
The Petition of Save Britain's Heritage	Ev 1511
The Petition of Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Ev 1525
The Petition of Tarmac Ltd	Ev 1527

**Thursday 19 July 2006**

The Petitions of Alistair & Eleanor Ferguson; Eleanor Ferguson; Gerald Collins & Mona Hatoum; and Caroline Hamilton	Ev 1545
---	---------

**Thursday 26 July 2006**

The Petitions of John Payne	Ev 1559
The Petitions of Open Spaces Society/Ramblers Association	Ev 1571

**Thursday 11 October 2006**

The Petition of Anne-Marie Cousins	Ev 1588
------------------------------------	---------

**Friday 12 October 2006**

The Petitions of Kempton Court Residents Committee and others	Ev 1596
The Petitions of D J Saunderson and D J Saunderson and K J Baxter	Ev 1598

**Tuesday 17 October 2006**

The Petition of London Borough of Tower Hamlets	Ev 1630
The Petition of The Eleanor Street Travellers All Residents Group	Ev 1634
The Petition of Paperback Ltd	Ev 1635

**Wednesday 18 October 2006**

The Petition of Fairfield Conservation Area Residents Association	Ev 1639
The Petitions of Barbara and Tony Wheeler	Ev 1660
The Petition of Anthony Chambers	Ev 1666

**Tuesday 16 January 2007**

The Petition of Emma Jeffrey	Ev 1673
The Petition of Barbara and Tony Wheeler	Ev 1678

**Wednesday 17 January 2007**

The Petitions of Alistair & Eleanor Ferguson; Eleanor Ferguson; Gerald Collins & Mona Hatoum; and Caroline Hamilton	Ev 1685
The Petition of The Barbican Association	Ev 1689

**Thursday 18 January 2007**

The Petition of Paddington Churches Housing Association	Ev 1690
The Petitions of G Selway and Michael Harrison	Ev 1697

**Thursday 25 January 2007**

The Petition of Open Spaces Society and Ramblers' Association	Ev 1706
The Petition of Great Western Allotment Association	Ev 1714

**Tuesday 30 January 2007**

The Petition of Spitalfields Community Association	Ev 1721
The Petitions of Roy Adams and Pascale Adams; and The Petitions of Fiona Atkins and others	Ev 1733
The Petition of Patricia Jones	Ev 1743
The Petitions of Robin Tutty and others	Ev 1747
The Petition of The Spitalfields Society	Ev 1749
The Petitions of Harold Critchley and Sandra Critchley	Ev 1755
The Petition of Spitalfields Small Business Association	Ev 1757

**Wednesday 31 January 2007**

The Petition of Jessica Da Silva and others	Ev 1764
The Petitions of Woodseer and Hanbury Residents Association	Ev 1768
The Petitions of GE Pensions Limited	Ev 1776

**Tuesday 6 February 2007**

The Petition of London Borough of Havering (on non-Romford depot issues)	Ev 1797
The Petitions of Paddington Residents' Active Concern on Transport	Ev 1809

**Wednesday 7 February 2007**

The Petition of Land Securities plc	Ev 1817
-------------------------------------	---------

**Thursday 8 February 2007**

The Petition of The British Land Company plc	Ev 1832
--	---------

**Tuesday 20 February 2007**

The Petition of Grand Central Studios	Ev 1834
---------------------------------------	---------

**Wednesday 21 February 2007**

The Petition of Grand Central Studios	Ev 1873
The Petition of Association of Professional Recording Studios and UK Post	Ev 1893
The Petition of City of London	Ev 1897
The Petition of Association of Professional Recording Studios and UK Post	Ev 1909
The Petition of The Residents' Society of Mayfair and St. James' and The Grosvenor Mayfair Residents' Association	Ev 1910

**Tuesday 27 February 2007**

The Petition of English Welsh and Scottish Railway Limited	Ev 1914
--	---------

**Tuesday 13 March 2007**

The Petition of London Borough of Tower Hamlets	Ev 1951
---	---------

**Wednesday 14 March 2007**

The Petition of Westbourne Park Villas Residents Association	Ev 1952
The Petitions of Marriott Hotels Limited; and West India Quay Development Company (Eastern) Limited	Ev 1973
The Petition of Canary Wharf Group plc	Ev 1980

**Tuesday 20 March 2007**

The Petition of West India Dock Commercial Ship Owners	Ev 1986
The Petition of Woodseer and Hanbury Street Residents Association	Ev 1994

**Wednesday 28 March 2007**

The Petition of Poplar Dock Boat Users Association	Ev 2008
The Petition of Trustees of the SS Robin Trust	Ev 2014
The Petition of The Residents' Society of Mayfair and St. James' and The Grosvenor Mayfair Residents' Association	Ev 2019

**Tuesday 10 July 2007**

The Petition of Citipost AMP Limited and Mr Daniel Albert Charlesworth	Ev 2040
--	---------

## List of unprinted evidence

---

The following memoranda have been reported to the House, but to save printing costs they have not been printed and copies have been placed in the Private Bill Office, where they may be inspected by Members. Other copies are in the Parliamentary Archives, and are available to the public for inspection. Requests for inspection should be addressed to The Parliamentary Archives, Houses of Parliament, London SW1A 0PW (tel. 020 7219 3074). Opening hours are from 9.30 am to 5.00 pm on Mondays to Fridays.

1	Proposed Amendments To Bill (in lieu of Filled Bill)	P1
2	Petition Response Document: Corporation of London and British Land	P2
3	Crossrail Information Papers	P3
4	Crossrail Environmental Statement – Non Technical Summary	P4
5	Crossrail Quick Guide	P5
6	British Land plc Opening Statement	A1
7	British Land plc Liverpool Street Station plans - Exhibit A	A2
8	Technical Annex to the proof of Evidence of Mr Tim Spencer	A3
9	Ordnance Survey Map of Broadgate	A4
10	Labour Histogram for Crossrail project	P6
11	Crossrail Meeting Note with Corporation of London, 3 December 2003	A5/P7
12	Crossrail Meeting Note with Corporation of London, 21 February 2005	A6/P8
13	Letter from Mr Weiss, Corporation of London, to Mr Norman Haste, Chief Executive, CLRL, 17 March 2005	A7
14	Exhibit J from Mr Joe Weiss	A8
15	Exhibit K from Mr Joe Weiss	A9
16	Letter to Mr Norman Haste, Chief Executive, CLRL. 17 March 2005	P9
17	Volume 4a Crossrail Environmental Statement, Central Route Section Mapping	P10
18	Transport for London 5 Year Investment Programme	P11
19	Liverpool Street Station: Demand and Capacity	A10
20	London Underground Limited, Guideline Document, Journey Time Stations Marketing & Planning, Station Demand	P12
21	London Underground Limited, Engineering Standard, Station Planning Doc No. E1024 A2, September 2000	P13
22	City of London Unitary Development Plan 2002	P14
23	Victoria line 2001 Demand (0845-0900) Pedroute	A11
24	Capacity of Liverpool Street Station	A12
25	Report of the City Planning Officer: Planning and Transportation Committee, 26 July 2005	A13
26	Capacity of Liverpool Street Station	A14
27	Letter from UBS AG to Mr Adrian Penfold, 18 January 2006	A15
28	Exhibits to the Proof of Evidence of Mr Tim Spencer	A16
29	Technical Annex to the Proof of Evidence of Mr Tim Spencer	A17
30	Station Demand Modelling LUL Guideline Document	P15
31	Victoria Line permute	P16
32	Proof of Evidence of Mr Tim Spencer	A18
33	Liverpool Street Station: Crossrail Design for Link with existing ticket hall	P17

34	Liverpool Street Station: with Crossrail Pedroutes	A19
35	Evidence from Mr Tim Chapman	A20
36	Street level view of proposed exit on Eldon Street	A21
37	Liverpool Street Station control	A22
38	The operation of Liverpool Street Station and the use of the procedure model	A23
39	Picture of Broadgate	A24
40	Liverpool Street Station undertakings	A25
41	Amended Moorgate and Liverpool Street walk times	A26
42	Amended version of City of London Plan to show 5 and 10 minutes walk times from Platforms	P18
43	Gateline plan – Liverpool Street Underground Station	P19
44	Promoter’s Position Statement – Liverpool Street Eastern Ticket Hall	A27
45	Promoter’s Closing Statement on Liverpool Street Station	A28
46	Corporation of London/British Land Company – Walk time isochrones for Liverpool Street Crossrail	A29
47	Corporation of London letter to Crossrail, 22 December 2005	A30
48	Corporation of London/City of London exhibits	A31
49	Amended walking times from Moorgate to Liverpool Street entrance	P20
50	Crossrail position statement on Liverpool Street Station	P21
51	Map of Covent Garden	A32
52	Noise and Vibration – Standards and Mitigation	A33/P22
53	Ground settlement and its effects	A34/P23
54	Exhibit folder of London Borough of Islington	A35
55	Advisor Report London Borough of Islington	A36
56	London Borough of Islington petition response document	P24
57	Farringdon Station aerial photograph	P25
58	Farringdon Station 3d axonometric view	P26
59	Farringdon Station 3d axonometric view western ticket hall (without Thameslink 2000)	P27
60	Farringdon Station 3d Eastern ticket hall	P28
61	Farringdon Station 3d axonometric view western ticket hall with Thameslink 2000	P29
62	Fox & Knot Street shaft - apex photo	P30
63	Undertaking to London Borough of Islington	P31
64	London Borough of Islington Exhibits	A35
65	Planning Policy Guidance 15 Extract – Introductory section 1.4; Construction and economic prosperity	P32
66	Department for Culture Media and Sport Consultation Document on Listing	P33
67	English Heritage - Advisor’s report Recommendation of 4 August 2005	P34
68	Charterhouse site layout drawing (No.1)	P35 <sup>1</sup>
69	Charterhouse site layout drawing (No.2)	P36 <sup>2</sup>
70	Crossrail Environmental Statement extract – Tottenham Court Road Station	A36
71	London Borough of Camden Petition on Groundborne Noise	A37

---

1 Crossrail Document Reference P37 was a duplicate of the previously supplied document referenced as P35.

2 Crossrail Document Reference P38 was a duplicate of the previously supplied document referenced as P36.

72	Crossrail Information Paper D1 – Crossrail Construction Code	P39
73	Crossrail Information Paper D10 – Groundborne Noise and Vibration	P40
74	Table RMT 1: Complaints of railway noise from the Victoria Line compiled in 1969	P41
75	Table RMT 2: Complaints of railway noise investigated by London Transport Research Laboratory 1970-79	P42
76	World Health Organisation, Guidelines for Community Noise	P43
77	Noise and Social Survey Non-technical Summary	P44
78	Additional Cost associated with Camden Design Criterion, Crossrail	A39/P45
79	Promoter’s Exhibits: City of Westminster	P46
80	Promoter’s Response Document: City of Westminster	P47
81	City of Westminster Exhibits	A41
82	Promoter’s Exhibits: Smithfield Market Tenants Association	P49
83	Note of Submissions on behalf on Smithfield Market Tenants Association	A42
84	Promoter’s Undertakings to Smithfield Market Tenants Association	A43
85	Smithfield Market Tenants Association Exhibits	A44
86	The Law Commission (LAW COM No 286) Towards A Compulsory Purchase Code: (1) Compensation Final Report, Cm, 6071, December 2003	A45
87	Buro Happold: Smithfield Market Expert Witness Report	A46
88	Promoter’s Response Document: Smithfield Market Tenants Association	P48
89	Note of Responses by the Promoter to Requests by Smithfield Market Tenants Association	P50
90	Smithfield Loading Bays – Estimate of loss of space	P51
91	Promoter’s submissions to Petition by Smithfield Market Traders	P52
92	Petitioner’s Closing Submission – Outstanding undertakings from the promoter	A47
93	Promoter’s Response Document: Springdene Ltd	P53
94	Promoter’s Exhibits: Springdene Ltd	P54
95	Springdene Ltd Exhibits	A48
96	Springdene Ltd: Proposed alternative site	A49
97	Springdene Ltd: Plans of Farringdon Station	P54
98	Photograph of Charterhouse Square	P55
99	Promoter’s Response Document: Stafford Partnership and Mercury Theatres Ltd.	P56
100	Stafford Partnership and Mercury Theatres Ltd: Summary Document	A50
101	London Borough of Islington Fox & Knot Street – Amended Scheme	P59
102	Promoter’s Response Document: Confederation of British Industry	P57
103	Promoter’s exhibits: Confederation of British Industry	P58
104	Confederation of British Industry Exhibits	A51
105	Confederation of British Industry Promoter’s exhibit: Hawkins Brown Report	A52
106	Crossrail letter to Confederation of British Industry, 13 March 2006	P60
107	Promoter’s note of assurances to Confederation of British Industry	P60
108	Liverpool Street Station options review – programme of works	A53
109	Liverpool Street Station Enlargement of Ticket Hall B	A54
110	Promoter’s Draft Undertaking for Salisbury House	A55
111	Promoter’s Response Document: EMI Music Publishing Ltd	P62

112	Promoter's Exhibit: EMI Music Publishing Ltd Meeting Minutes Note	P63
113	EMI Music Publishing Ltd Exhibits	A56
114	EMI Music Publishing Ltd Proof of Evidence	A57
115	Promoter's Combined Response Document: British Board of Film Classification; Grand Central Sound Studios Ltd; and Antique Hypermarket Ltd	P64
116	British Board of Film Classification Exhibits	A58
117	British Board of Film Classification, Noise and Vibration from Construction Exhibits	A59
118	Minutes of the BBFC Council meeting of 11 January 2006	A60
119	Minutes of the BBFC Council meeting of 9 February 2006	A61
120	International standard - Cinematography	P65
121	Proposed specially constructed and insulated escalator	P66
122	Sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings: BS8233:1999	A62
123	Promoter's Response Document: Grand Central Sound Studios	P67
124	Grand Central Studios Ltd Exhibits	A63
125	Promoter's Response Document: Brentwood Petitioners	P68
126	Promoters Exhibit Bundle: Brentwood Petitioners	P69
127	Promoter's Response Document: Petitioner's in Brentwood/ Brentwood Borough Council	P70
128	Summary of Issues List Petitioners - Residents of Shenfield	A64
129	Brentwood Borough Council Exhibits	A65
130	Brentwood Petitioners' Exhibits	A66
131	Petitioners Exhibits - Summary of Exhibits (C B Brimbley)	A67
132	Petitioners Exhibits - Summary of Exhibits (G R Boyton)	A68
133	Crossrail Benefits Shenfield Brentwood List	P71
134	Notes for Promoter's Closing in relation to Shenfield petitioners and Brentwood Borough Council	P72
135	Petitioner - Appendix 4, 81.1 Journey Time savings to/from Shenfield (Platform to Platform)	A71
136	Letter to C G Brimley Head of Transport and Parking, Brentwood Council from Burrows	A72
137	Combined PDR Petitioner responses to Ingrid Meldal-Johnsen, Alison Human & Antoine Lurot ; Mintel International Group Ltd; Residents' Association of Mayfair & St James' & The Grosvenor Mayfair Residents' Association; Andreas Lyson; Dr Nickolaus Hensen; George Iascobescu, Raymond Greene, Shirley Greene & Sarah Cooper; and Leo Walters	P73
138	Correspondence from Leo Walters	A73
139	Mintel International Group Ltd Exhibits	A74
140	Exhibits of Mr Jim Griffiths	A75
141	The Residents Society of Mayfair and St James' Exhibits	A76
142	Mr Michael Schabas Exhibits.	A80
143	Super Crossrail and Superlink Update Report	P74
144	London Borough of Havering – Petitioner's Exhibits	A81
145	Promoter's Response Document: London Borough of Havering	P75
146	London Borough of Havering – Martyn Thomas' Exhibits	A82
147	Promoter's Response Document: Angela and Jonathan King	P76
148	Promoter's Response Document: London Borough of Greenwich	P77

149	London Borough of Greenwich Opening Statement	A83
150	London Borough of Greenwich, Proofs of Evidence and Supporting Material	A84
151	Further Exhibit from the Promoters: London Borough of Greenwich	P78
152	London Borough of Greenwich – Further Exhibits	A85
153	London Borough of Greenwich Closing Statement	A86
154	London Borough of Greenwich – Woolwich Station Comparisons	A87
155	Promoter’s Response Document: London Borough of Bexley	P80
156	Promoter’s Exhibits: London Borough of Bexley	P81
157	London Borough of Bexley: Exhibits of Chris Hardie	A88
158	London Borough of Bexley: The Business Case for Ebbsfleet	A89
159	London Borough of Bexley: Exhibits of Mr Christopher Donovan	A90
160	Correspondence from CLRL to London Borough of LB Bexley, 11 May 2006	A91
161	Abbey Wood – Effect on Crossrail on the station, changes in passenger flows	A92
162	London Borough of Bexley: Letter to Stephen Burke - Environment and Regeneration/Transport Model CAPITAL	A93
163	Tables contained in David Anderson’s Letter to Stephen Burke	A94
164	Promoter’s Combined Response Document: David Waterman; I Waterman Ltd; The AA Waterman Trust; Alberon Securities Limited; Executor of AA Waterman, Trustees of I Waterman; Pension Limited; Ann-Marie Cousins; Gareth Pearce; and James Middleton	P82
165	Exhibits of Gareth Pearce	A95
166	Exhibits of Gareth Pearce	A96
167	Exhibits of Gareth Pearce	A97
168	Exhibits of Gareth Pearce	A98
169	Projected London Regional Transport Plan 1994	A99
170	James Middleton: Proposed Route Plan of Alternative Regional Crossrail	A100
171	James Middleton: Statement	A101
172	Promoter’s Combined Response Document: LA 21 Traffic and Transport; Belvedere Investments; Iron Mountain (UK) Limited; Tilfen Land Limited; Alternative Mail and Parcels Ltd; and Ferrotec (UK) Ltd	P83
173	Promoter’s Exhibits: Ferrotec (UK) Limited	P84
174	Ferrotec (UK) Limited exhibits	A102
175	Promoter’s Combined Response Document: DB Investments; Swanlea School; East London Line Group; Wan & Pang Limited; and The Reverend Christopher Burke	P85
176	Promoter’s Exhibits: The Reverend Christopher Burke	P86
177	Promoter’s Combined Response Document: Kempton Court Residents; and Southend Arterial Road Action Group	P87
178	Promoter’s Exhibits: Kempton Court Residents	P88
179	Kempton Court Residents’ Exhibits	A103
180	Kempton Court Residents’ Evidence	A104
181	Correspondence between Kempton Court Residents’ and CLRL	A105
182	Correspondence between Kempton Court Residents’ and CLRL	A106
183	Southend Arterial Road Action Group Exhibits	A107
184	Swanlea School Exhibits	A108
185	East London Line Group Exhibits	A109
186	Promoter’s Response Document: London Borough of Tower Hamlets	P86

187	London Borough of Tower Hamlets' Exhibits	A110
188	Promoter's Exhibits: London Borough of Tower Hamlets	P87
189	Promoter's Combined Response Document: The Spitalfields Society; Annetta Pedretti; Fiona Atkins & Others; Roy Adams & Pascale Adams; Melanie & Nicholas Symons; Jessica Da Silva & Others; Belal Udin & Others; Huguenot Court Limited; Mark Stephen & Suzanne Mary Lancaster; Panayiotis Cleovoulou & Others; Dr S J Goodbody & Mr T R A Sparks; Robin Tutty & Others; Commodore Critchley & Mrs Critchley; and Shahjalal Community Group	P88
190	Promoter's Exhibits: Tower Hamlets	P89
191	Crossrail Note on Compensation	A111
192	Dr Annetta Pedretti's Exhibits	A112
193	Mr Rupert Wheeler's Exhibits	A113
194	Mr Mark Lancaster's Exhibits	A114
195	Mr Mark Lancaster's Exhibit: Depth of Tunnel – Settlement Impact	A115
196	Commodore Critchley's Exhibits	A116
197	Promoter's Combined Response Document: Friends of Mile End Park; The Spitalfields Trust; The Spitalfield Practice; John Akker & E Hill; Oliver Theis & Others; Ali Nehru & Others; Alistair & Eleanor Ferguson; Eleanor Ferguson Gerald Collins & Mona Hatoum; Caroline Hamilton; and Mr George Galloway MP	P90
198	Mr John Akker's Exhibits	A117
199	Promoter's Exhibit: Spitalfields	P91
200	Correspondence between CLRL and the Commission for Racial Equality	P92
201	Spitalfield's Festival Exhibits	A118
202	Eleanor Ferguson & Others' Exhibits	A119
203	Promoter's Combined Response Document: Spitalfields Festival Ltd; Spitalfields Centre; Spitalfields Community Association; Spitalfields Housing Association; and Patricia Jones	P93
204	The Spitalfields Centre Exhibits	A120
205	Spitalfields Community Association Exhibits	A121
206	Crossrail National Opinion Poll Surveys Market Survey 2004	P94
207	Crossrail National Opinion Poll Surveys Market Survey 2005	P95
208	Crossrail Whitechapel Station Passenger Forecast	P96
209	Promoter's Combined Response Document: Spitalfields Trust; Christchurch PCC; Jemima Broadbridge; Thomas Sparks and Susan Goodbody; Spitalfields Small Business Association Association Ltd; Woodseer & Hanbury Residents Association; and Guy Carpenter	P97
210	Saving of Spitalfields; Information on Spitalfields Trust	A122
211	Jemima Broadbridge: Location Map	A123
212	Christchurch PCC Exhibits	A124
213	Spitalfields Small Business Association Exhibits	A125
214	Correspondence from Woodseer & Hanbury Residents Association	A126
215	Woodseer & Hanbury Residents Association Exhibits	A127
216	Guy Carpenter's Exhibit	A128
217	Promoter's Combined Response Document: Westminster City Council; Orbiton Investments Ltd Apple London, Cedarspan Ltd, Olivetree Properties Ltd, Queensway Associates Ltd; Monnaie Properties Ltd & Nargis Ltd; Muirgold Ltd; Land Securities Plc Ravenseft Properties LS Aldersgate Ltd,	

	The City of London Real Property Company Ltd; Paddington Business Improvement District Ltd; Paddington Central I (GP) Ltd & Paddington Central II (GP) Ltd; DAS Europe Ltd & BMP DDB Ltd; Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd; Paddington Residents Active Concern Transport (PRACT); Rodney Cyril Fitzgerald; Katie Black; John Shepherd & Others	P99
218	Mayor of London Press Release, 6 June 2006	A129
219	City of Westminster's Response to the Crossrail Bill proposals	A130
220	Promoter's Closing Submission Note for London Borough of Tower Hamlets Petitioners – Spitalfields Area	P100
221	Paddington Resident's Active Concern on Transport (PRACT); Rodney Fitzgerald; Katie Black; and John Shepherd Exhibits	A131
222	Promoter's Combined Response Document: St Mary's NHS Trust ; The Prudential Assurance Company Ltd, Prudential Holborn Life Ltd, Fox Court1 Ltd, Fox Court Ltd2, Kleinwort Benson (Guernsey) Trustees Ltd and Borrowdale Nominees Ltd; The Association of Professional Recording Services Ltd, UK Post Ltd; Great Western Studios Management Ltd; Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea; and The Council of the London Borough of Ealing	P101
223	Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea Exhibits	A132
224	Revised Code of Construction Practice	A133
225	Promoter's Combined Response Document: Maidenhead Civic Society & others; Axa Sun Life Plc; Villiers Park Properties Plc; British Broadcasting Corporation; Castlemore Securities Ltd; Hall Aggregates Ltd; Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead; Laing Homes Limited; Boyne Valley Property Co Ltd; Mai Forbes Pirie; Thames Reach Residents Association; Joanne Bainton; Westbourne Park Villas Residents Association; Theresa May MP; The Association of Councils of the Thames Valley Region; The East of England Regional Assembly; and Jean Lambert MEP & Others	P101 <sup>3</sup>
226	Promoter's Exhibits: Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead	P102
227	Maidenhead Civic Society & Others Exhibits	A134
228	Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead Exhibits	A135
229	Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead Supporting Documents	A136
230	Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead: Impact of Crossrail	A137
231	Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead: Peter Hitchen Evidence	A138
232	Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead: Maidenhead Bridge Report	A139
233	Thames Reach Residents Association Exhibits	A140
234	Westbourne Park Villas Residents' Association Map	A141
235	Amendment of Provision Map	A142
236	Westbourne Park Villas Residents' Association: London Noise Map	A143
237	Mrs Theresa May Response Document	A144
238	East of England Regional Assembly: Crossrail Timetable Working Group Report	A145
239	Correspondence from Department of Transport: Funding from the Productivity Transport Innovation Fund	A146
240	Crossrail Information Paper – E5 Provisions for People with Reduced Mobility	A147
241	Future inclusion – Provision for people with reduced mobility, Alice Maynard	P103

---

3 Two volumes of the Promoter's Combined Response Documents were numbered P101.

242	List of Liverpool Street Ticket Hall Options	A148/P104
243	Liverpool Street Station – Demand Estimation and Passenger Flow Modelling – LUL Commentary on approach of Crossrail Project	A149/P105
244	British Land Co plc and Corporation of London evidence	A150
245	London Underground Good Practice Guide	A151
246	British Land Co plc and Corporation of London: Supplementary Exhibits	A152
247	British Land Co plc and Corporation of London: Exhibits	A153
248	British Land Co plc: Exhibits of Tim Chapman	A154
249	British Land Co plc: Exhibits of Mr Tim Spencer	A155
250	Crossrail Timetable The Working Group Report	P106
251	Performance Modelling of the Base Timetable	P107
252	Promoter’s Combined Response Document: Association of Train Operating Companies; London Eastern Railway Limited (trading as One Rail) C2C Rail Limited & Silverlink Train Services Limited; London Transport users Committee & Rail Passenger Council; South East England Regional Assembly; Robert Wilson MP; Martin Salter MP & Reading Evening Post; Thames Valley Chamber of Commerce Group; Frank Brown; Thames Gateway London Partnership; The Rail Freight Group; Freight Transport Association Limited; and Tarmac Limited	P108
253	Crossrail Route Adjacent Franchises - Map	A157
254	Extract from the London Olympic Games and Paralympic Games Act 2006	A158
255	Statement by Rufus Barnes	A159
256	The South West Regional Assembly Exhibits	A160
257	Martin Salter MP & The Reading Evening Post Exhibits	A161
258	Letter from Department of Transport on Bill Powers, 29 June 2006	P109
259	Exhibits of Frank Browne	A162
260	Crossrail Train Timetable	P110
261	Thames Gateway London Partnership Exhibits	A163
262	Freight Transport Association Ltd Exhibits	A164
263	Tarmac Ltd: David Cole	A165
264	Tarmac Ltd: Mike Garratt Evidence	A166
265	Promoter’s Combined Response Document: Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd; English, Welsh & Scottish Railway Ltd; Freightliner Group Ltd; Mendip Rail Ltd; Aggregate Industries (UK); Plasmor Ltd; London Concrete Ltd; Day Group Ltd; The Quarry Products Association Ltd; The Hanson Quarry Products Europe Ltd & Pioneer Willment Concrete Ltd; Foster Yeoman Ltd & Yeoman Aggregates Ltd; London Thames Gateway Forum; Haven Gateway Partnership; Hutchinson Ports (UK) Ltd The Felixstowe Dock & Railway Co, Harwich International Port Ltd and Maritime Transport Services Ltd UK; Maersk Company Ltd; and London International Exhibition Centre Plc	P111
266	Promoter’s Generic Exhibits for Week 22	P112
267	Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd Exhibits	A167
268	English, Welsh & Scottish Railway Ltd (EWS) Exhibits	A168
269	Mendip Rail Ltd Exhibits	A169
270	Freightliner Group Ltd Exhibits	A170
271	The Quarry Products Association Limited Exhibits	A171
272	The London Thames Gateway Forum Exhibits	A172
273	Hutchinson Ports (UK) Limited (HPUK) Exhibits	A173

274	Hutchinson Ports (UK) Limited (HPUK): Mike Garratt Evidence	A174
275	Maersk Company Limited: Soren Friis Evidence	A175/1 – 2
276	ExCel Centre Exhibits	A176
277	ExCel Centre: Position Statement on Matters Not Agreed with the Promoter	A177
278	Minutes of Meeting between CLRL and Excel, 26 June 2006	P113
279	Correspondence from ExCel to London Borough of Newham	P114
280	Clause for Protection of London International Exhibition Centre plc	A178
281	Mendip Rail Ltd Exhibits	A179
282	Brief on Costs – Note for committee who requested costs for BBFC mitigation/relocation	A180
283	Promoter’s Combined Response Document: British Airways Plc; Surrey County Council; Save Britain’s Heritage; Royal Mail Group Plc & Post Office Limited; Cardinal Group Ltd; British Telecommunication Plc; EDF Energy Networks Ltd; and Thames Water Utilities Limited	P115
284	Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead Exhibits	A181
285	Save Britain’s Heritage Exhibits	A182
286	Freight Industry – General Submissions on Rail Petitions	P116
287	Correspondence from CLRL to Ms Eleanor Ferguson, 17 August 2004	A183
288	Ms Eleanor Ferguson Exhibit: Residents of Mayfair and others extract	A184
289	Promoter’s Combined Response Document: John Payne; The Open Space Society & Ramblers Association; McDonalds; and Slough Heat & Power	P117
290	Mr John Payne Exhibits	A184
291	Open Spaces Society and the Ramblers Association	A185
292	Promoter’s Combined Response Document: Anne Marie Cousins; Thornfield Properties; Stockley Park Consortium Ltd; Norrdeutscher Rundfunk; Kempton Court Residents Committee; and D J Saunderson, D J Saunderson and K J Baxter	P118
293	Promoter’s Response to the Select Committee’s interim Decision	P119
294	Ms Ann-Marie Cousins Exhibits	A186
295	Ms Ann-Marie Cousins Exhibits	A187
296	Ms Ann-Marie Cousins Exhibits	A188
297	Ms Ann-Marie Cousins Exhibits	A189
298	Promoter’s Exhibit: D J Saunderson and D J Saunderson and K J Baxter	P120
299	Correspondence from Department for Transport to Bircham Dyson Bell	P121
300	Kempton Court Residents Committee and others	A190
301	D J Saunderson and D J Saunderson and K J Baxter Exhibits	A191
302	D J Saunderson and D J Saunderson and K J Baxter Exhibits	A192
303	Promoter’s Combined Response Document: London Borough of Tower Hamlets; M J McIntyre; Eleanor Street Travellers All Residents Group; Paperback Ltd; Fairfield Conservation Area Residents; Barbara and Tony Wheeler; Anthony Chambers; Emma Jeffrey; Gallifordtry Partnerships Ltd; East Homes Ltd; Paddington Churches Housing Association; Southern Housing Group Ltd; City of London; The Barbican Association; Ian Mackenzie; and Salisbury House Offices Ltd	P122
304	Promoter’s Exhibits: London Borough of Tower; M J McIntyre; and Paperback Ltd	P123
305	Letter from Tom Mantey to Mr Robert Harvey	P124
306	Notice to occupiers for Paperback Ltd	P125

307	Promoter's Exhibits: Ham & Wick Sewer	P126
308	Tunnel Gradient and Long Section –1 Baldock Street, Bow E3	P127
309	Fairfield Conservation Area Residents Association	A193
310	Promoter's Exhibits: Not used	P128
311	Promoter's Exhibits: Not used	P129
312	Promoter's Combined Response Document: Emma Jeffrey; and Barbara and Tony Wheeler; Eleanor Ferguson; Gerald Collins and Mona Hatoum; Caroline Hamilton; and The Barbican Association	P130
313	Promoter's Exhibits: Emma Jeffrey	P131
314	Emma Jeffrey Statement	A194
315	Promoter's Exhibits: Ham & Wick Sewer	P132
316	Mrs Barbara Wheeler and Mr Tony Wheeler Statement	A195
317	Promoter's exhibits: Eleanor Ferguson; Gerald Collins and Mona Hatoum; Caroline Hamilton; and The Barbican Association	P133
318	Bikes and Trains Document	A196
319	Traffic Advisory Document	A197
320	LRT and Cyclists' Guidelines for Planning and Designs	A198
321	Gordon Selway Summary Document	A199
322	Correspondence from CLRL to Mr Gordon Selway, National Council of the Cyclists' Touring Club (CTC), 17 October 2006	P134
323	Spitalfields Monitoring Body Liaison Panel Report	A200
324	Promoter's Combined Response Document: Open Spaces Society and Ramblers' Association and Great Western Allotment Association	P135
325	Open Spaces Society and Ramblers' Association Exhibits	A201
326	Open Spaces Society and Ramblers' Association: Mrs Glenda Collins Exhibits	A202
327	Great Western Allotment Association Exhibits	A203
328	Promoter exhibit folder for Spitalfields petitioners (generic)	P136
329	Spitalfields Community Association Document	A204
330	Extract from Crossrail Assessment Report for numbers 17 to 25 Princelet Street	A205
331	The Spitalfields Society comments on SES in respect of Noise	A206
332	Patricia Jones Exhibits	A207
333	Spitalfields Small Business Association Exhibits	A208
334	Spitalfields Small Business Association Exhibits	A209
335	Spitalfields Small Business Association Exhibits	A210
336	Spitalfields Small Business Association Exhibits	A211
337	Weston Williamson Document	A212
338	Correspondence from Woodseer and Hanbury Residents' Association, 29 January 2007	A213
339	Correspondence from Woodseer and Hanbury Residents' Association, 30 January 2007	A214
340	Correspondence from Spitalfields Community Association	A215
341	Promoter's exhibits: GE Pensions Ltd	P137
342	GE Pensions Ltd Exhibits	A216
343	Bond Street Proposals for Additional Provision	A217
344	Promoter's Combined Response Document: London Borough of Havering (on non-Romford depot issues); Paddington Residents' Active Concern on Transport; Land Securities plc; and The British Land Company plc	P138

345	London Borough of Havering (on non-Romford depot issues); and Paddington Residents' Active Concern on Transport Exhibits	P139
346	London Borough of Havering Exhibits bundle	A218
347	Promoters Additional Generic Exhibits for Paddington	P140
348	Promoter Additional Exhibits for Land Securities	P141
349	Land Securities Exhibits	A219
350	Promoter Exhibits: UBS AG; and The British Land Company Plc	P142
351	Promoter's Combined Response Document: Grand Central Studios; Association of Professional Recording Services; City of London; Westminster City Council; and Residents' Society of Mayfair and St James	P143
352	Promoter Additional Exhibits: Grand Central Studios	P144
353	Promoters Exhibits: Grand Central Studios; Association of Professional Recording Services; City of London; Westminster City Council; and Residents' Society of Mayfair and St James	P145
354	Grand Central Studios Exhibits	A220
355	Grand Central Studios: Dr Hunt Evidence	A221
356	Grand Central Studios: David Bell Evidence	A222
357	Noise and Vibration Assessment and Mitigation to Report on the Resilience of Slab Track Tunnel Vibration Predictions, March 1998	A223
358	Draft undertaking to Grand Central Studios	A224
359	Section 16(1), London Transport (Liverpool Street) Act 1983; and Section 21, London Docklands Railway 1984	A225
360	Awards and Nominations for the UK post-production and effects sector	A226
361	Crossrail Tunnels – Predicted Floating Slab Track Costs	A227
362	Void	A228
363	City of London Heritage Deeds – Smithfield Market, June 2006	A229
364	Residents' Society of Mayfair and St James Exhibits	A230
365	Promoter's Response Document: English, Welsh and Scottish Railway Limited	P146
366	Promoter exhibits: English, Welsh and Scottish Railway Limited	P147
367	English, Welsh and Scottish Railway Limited exhibits	A231
368	State of the Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg v Berthe Linster, Aloyse Linster and Yvonne Linster	A232
369	New Proposed Undertaking by the Promoter to the Committee or to English, Welsh and Scottish Railway Limited	A233
370	Promoter's Combined Response Document: Bombardier Transportation UK Limited; London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham; London Borough of Ealing; and FirstGroup plc on behalf of First Greater Western Limited and Centrewest London Buses Limited	P148
371	Promoter's exhibits: Bombardier Transportation UK Limited; London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham; London Borough of Ealing; and FirstGroup plc on behalf of First Greater Western Limited and Centrewest London Buses Limited	P149
372	Promoter's Combined Response Document: Environment Agency; London Borough of Havering (Depot); Lafarge Aggregates; Alan Clarke; Romford Crossrail Action Group (CAG); Kevin Higgins; St Edward's C of E Comprehensive School; and Clive Diebelius	P150
373	Romford Station – Statement to the Select Committee	P151
374	Correspondence from Crossrail to the London Borough of Tower Hamlets, 21 February 2007	A234

375	Correspondence from Crossrail to the London Borough of Tower Hamlets, 7 March 2007	A235
376	Promoter's exhibits: Westbourne Park Villas Residents' Association	P152
377	Westbourne Park Villas Residents' Association Exhibits	A236
378	Westbourne Park Villas Residents' Association: Sound Barrier Systems letter	A237
379	London Marriott West India Quay Hotel Exhibits	A238
380	London Marriott West India Quay Hotel Further Exhibits	A239
381	Canary Wharf Group Plc Exhibits	A240
382	Canary Wharf Group Plc Evidence	A241
383	Promoter's Combined Response Document: West India Dock Commercial Ship Owners; and Woodseer and Hanbury Street Residents Association	P153
384	Promoter exhibits: West India Dock Commercial Ship Owners; and Woodseer and Hanbury Street Residents Association	P154
385	West India Dock Commercial Ship Owners Exhibits	A242
386	Woodseer and Hanbury Residents Association Evidence	A243
387	Promoter's Combined Response Document: Poplar Dock Boat Users Association; Trustees of the SS Robin Trust; and Residents' Society of Mayfair and St James	P155
388	Promoter Exhibits: Poplar Dock Boat Users Association	P156
389	Poplar Dock Boat Users Association Exhibits	A244
390	British Waterways Statement	A245
391	Trustees of the SS Robin Trust Exhibits	A246
392	Promoter exhibits: Residents' Society of Mayfair and St James	P157
393	Promoter's closing submissions following the completion of hearings into petitions against the bill and three sets of additional provisions	A247
394	Promoters opening on Woolwich additional provision and other matters	P158
395	Promoter's Response Document: Citipost AMP Limited and Mr Daniel Albert Charlesworth	P159
396	Citipost AMP Limited and Mr Daniel Albert Charlesworth Exhibits	A247
397	Proposed Undertaking to Parliament – Over-Site Development at Woolwich	P160
398	Non-Binding Outline Agreement on Station Box at Woolwich	A248
399	Committee's ability to award costs	A249
400	Lease/Licence/Grant of Option	A250
401	Amendments submitted to the Select Committee, dated 4 July 2007	A251
402	Supplementary Undertaking: Environmental Minimum Requirements	P161
403	Undertaking of powers not to be exercised if AP's are approved	P162
404	Access Option Note	P163
405	Filled Bill Amendments	P164

# List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament

---

## Session 2005–06

First Special Report    The Crossrail Bill: Woolwich Station

HC 1597