

Crossrail Bill Select Committee

Promoter's Response to the Select Committee's Interim Decisions

9 October 2007

Introduction

This document constitutes the response of the Promoter of the Crossrail Bill to the interim decisions made on 12 July 2007 by the House of Commons Select Committee on the Crossrail Bill.

1 Fairfield Conservation Area Residents Association

Committee Decision

The Association appeared before the Committee in October 2006 concerned about the impact of Crossrail on Grove Hall Park, the only green space in the area. The Committee is satisfied that the Promoter has taken necessary precautions to minimise the disruption to the park. However, we are concerned about the possible effect on the park and we would like to see Crossrail have a positive long-term impact on this valuable green space.

We ask the Promoters to liaise with the Association and the community to agree a suitable further enhancement of the park following the Crossrail works.

Government Response

- 1.1 The Promoter has 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.
- 1.2 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.

2 Barbara and Tony Wheeler and Emma Jeffery

Committee Decision

Mr and Mrs Wheeler appeared before the Committee on two occasions concerned about the impact of the Crossrail tunnels beneath their property. They are also affected by the placement of two worksites in close proximity to their home. The Wheelers requested that floating slab track be used in the

tunnels under their house to minimise the noise of trains in the tunnels. We also heard a petition from Emma Jeffery whose property is located 15 metres above the same tunnel; she had similar concerns. We accept the Wheelers will 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 Promoters.

To ensure a fair and consistent approach to the Petitioners' concerns, we ask the Promoter to ensure that floating slab track is installed in all tunnels which are routed under residential property at the depth of 15 metres or less.

Government Response

- 2.1 The Promoter accepts the Committee's decision, and 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 rises to within 15 metres or less of the building.
- 2.2 An explanation of how these buildings will be determined is provided in the first part of Annex A, together with an illustration of the locations where this undertaking is likely to apply. The precise vertical alignment of the Crossrail tunnels – and hence the actual buildings to which this undertaking will apply – will not be finalised until after the detailed design stage is completed.

Committee Decision

We would also like to receive a note detailing the expected reduction in noise and vibration that would be experienced in residential housing when using this technology at all such points on the line. This note should indicate the depth of tunnels in each case.

Government Response

- 2.3 The Promoter has carried out revised groundborne noise modelling, using an assumed floating slab track design, to illustrate the predicted reduction in groundborne noise levels that the installation of floating slab track would deliver at the residential buildings at the locations identified in the first part of Annex A.
- 2.4 The Crossrail operational groundborne noise design criterion for residential buildings is 40 $\text{dBL}_{\text{Amax,S}}$. Specifically, the installation of floating slab track is predicted to reduce the groundborne noise level at 1 Baldock Street (Barbara and Tony Wheeler) from 32 $\text{dBL}_{\text{Amax,S}}$ (with the standard trackform) to 19 $\text{dBL}_{\text{Amax,S}}$, and to reduce the groundborne noise level at 48 Wrexham Road (Emma Jeffery) from 33 $\text{dBL}_{\text{Amax,S}}$ (with the standard trackform) to 20 $\text{dBL}_{\text{Amax,S}}$.
- 2.5 Further illustrative results are shown in the second part of Annex A.

3 Soho and Grand Central Sound Studios

Committee Decision

The Committee is concerned that the building and use of Crossrail will seriously affect an international centre of excellence in Soho. The Committee accepts that the various sound studios in the Soho area are an exceptional example of British business, talent and ingenuity. Therefore, we want to ensure that such businesses are not seriously jeopardised by the construction or operations of Crossrail.

Therefore, we ask the Promoter to ensure that floating slab track is installed in all the tunnels in the Soho area. As before, we wish to make clear that should a better technology arise before the construction of the tunnels takes place, it should be considered for use as a substitute to floating slab track. We wish to see floating slab track used as a minimum requirement in such tunnels.

We also insist that every effort is made to provide these studios with sufficient sound proofing. Should the business be affected by the tunnelling process, we expect that the Petitioners should be able to claim compensation under the terms set out in the Bill. We are not minded to increase the provision of compensation in this case as we wish to ensure that the industry is protected in its current location.

However, we agree that Crossrail must take every useful mitigation measure to ensure that this important industry is able to continue working in its current location.

Government Response

- 3.1 The Promoter accepts the Committee's decision, and will require the nominated undertaker to install floating slab track as the permanent track support system in the Crossrail running tunnels in the Soho area, which, for the purposes of this undertaking, will be taken as that part of the route that lies between Regent Street and Charing Cross Road.
- 3.2 It is the Promoter's policy to mitigate potential groundborne noise impacts at the source of the noise – for example, by installing track using modern technology to achieve very much more accurately laid and smoother track than exists in traditional tube tunnels; by using continuously welded rail; and, as in this case, by installing floating slab track – rather than at the receptor of the noise by means of, for example, the provision of soundproofing.
- 3.3 The Promoter believes that the provision of mitigation at source is 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 indicate that there is no reason why the studios in Soho ought not to be able to continue working in their current location.

- 3.4 The Crossrail operational groundborne noise design criterion for sound recording studios is 30 dBL_{Amax,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 dBL_{Amax,S}. The installation of floating slab track is predicted to reduce the groundborne noise levels to between 10 and 18 dBL_{Amax,S}.¹
- 3.5 The Promoter therefore believes that the provision of floating slab track as the permanent track support system in the Crossrail running tunnels in the Soho area is the most effective mitigation measure that can be taken for these sound recording studios.

4 Floating slab track

Committee Decision

We also wish to make it clear that should a better technology arise before the construction of the tunnels takes place, it should be considered for use as a substitute to floating slab track.

Government Response

- 4.1 The Promoter can confirm that if, prior to the detailed design development of the Crossrail permanent track support system, a better trackform technology than floating slab track becomes available, then its use will be considered.

Committee Decision

We wish also to point out to the Promoters that the Committee were minded to recommend that the entire Crossrail route uses floating slab track. Crossrail has the potential to be the jewel in the crown of London's transport system. It offers an incredible opportunity to significantly reduce the disruption experienced by London residents and workers as trains pass in the tunnels below them. However, we recognise that such a decision may have a considerable impact on the cost of the construction of the railway, so at this stage we merely ask the Promoters to explore the practicality and feasibility of such a recommendation and then report back to the Committee in October.

Government Response

- 4.2 A paper exploring the cost and practicability of installing floating slab track as the permanent track support system in all Crossrail running tunnels is provided at Annex B.

¹ These figures represent the sound pressure level at the basement of the premises. Areas within the studios such as existing isolated booths will have sound reduction installed as standard, meaning that the level will be lower still at these locations.

- 4.3 As the paper explains, the Promoter continues to believe that the additional cost of £53-62m (at 1Q 2002 prices) of installing floating slab track in all Crossrail running tunnels does not represent good value for money. As was made clear in evidence to the Committee, this is because the blanket provision of floating slab track would deliver no benefit to receptors located above the tunnels, either because floating slab track would have been installed in any event (if they triggered the proposed Crossrail design criterion), or because the noise levels they would have received using the standard trackform would not have materially affected them. Indeed, certain sections of the route do not require noise attenuation from any form of floating slab track – for example, where there are no sensitive receptors above the tunnels or where the tunnels are, by any objective standard, at considerable depth.
- 4.4 For these reasons, notwithstanding the fact that the Promoter has accepted the Committee’s decisions in respect of installing floating slab track in the running tunnels in the Soho area and those that are 15 metres or less below residential buildings, the Promoter continues to believe that the better approach, rather than committing to the use of a particular trackform technology now, is the one that it has adopted – namely, the giving of a commitment in terms of the design criteria for the performance of the railway for sensitive receptors.

5 Eleanor Ferguson and others

Committee Decision

We are convinced that Eleanor Ferguson and her fellow Petitioners, Mona Hatoum and Gerry and Caroline Collins, should be afforded the same level of comfort in the compulsory purchase of their properties as that afforded by Crossrail to the Petitioners EMI. It was not our intention that the Promoters should treat these Petitioners differently.

Therefore, we ask that the properties overlooking the Hanbury Street shaft which are subject to compulsory purchase orders should be purchased at the same time as the EMI building. This must be as soon as practicable after Royal Assent and, in any case, as soon as the funding for the Bill is secured. We find it not acceptable to purchase these properties merely nine months before construction actually starts. It has always been our view that Crossrail would be able to rent or sell these flats in due course and should not experience undue expense in the process.

Government Response

- 5.1 In response to the Committee’s earlier decision with regards to these petitioners in July 2006, the Promoter accepted the Committee’s judgement that the occupiers of the flats within 61 Princelet Street were likely to be extraordinarily affected should an intervention and emergency access shaft be constructed in Hanbury Street. In October 2006, the Promoter wrote to Eleanor Ferguson, Mona Hatoum and Gerald Collins, and Caroline Hamilton,

undertaking to purchase their properties no sooner than 9 months before the works on the Hanbury Street worksite began.

- 5.2 The Promoter notes the comparison drawn by the Committee with the case of EMI, whose premises are subject to a compulsory purchase order under the Bill, and are required for the construction of the scheme. The Promoter continues to believe that the mechanism of discretionary purchase, as applied through the hardship scheme, is an appropriate vehicle for dealing with cases of non-statutory blight – such as the 61 Princelet Street petitioners, whose properties are not required for the construction of the scheme.
- 5.3 Nevertheless, in recognition of the Committee’s continuing concern over the level of comfort afforded to these petitioners, and on a wholly exceptional basis, the Promoter 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 offered to purchase their properties at a time of their choosing from receiving notification of Royal Assent until the construction of the Hanbury Street shaft has been completed. The form of this undertaking is provided at Annex C.

6 National Council of the Cycling Touring Club

Committee Decision

The Committee looks to Crossrail to continue its dialogue with the National Council of the Cycling Touring Club to ensure that the policy of the carriage of cycles is well informed. We accept that the train operating company, not Crossrail, will decide the final policy but we expect that the policy should be cycle-friendly and in line with Transport for London and London Underground policies.

Government Response

- 6.1 The Promoter reiterates the assurance given to the National Council of the Cycling Touring Club (CTC) in October 2006, and again during the Committee hearings in January 2007, that the Promoter will maintain a dialogue with CTC about the carriage of cycles on Crossrail trains.
- 6.2 As the Committee acknowledges, the final policy with regards to cycle carriage on Crossrail will be a matter for the Train Operating Company (TOC) responsible for the railway at that time, but the Promoter can confirm that the policy will be guided by Transport for London and London Underground policy, and by BAA policy in respect of the Heathrow spur.

Committee Decision

We would also ask the Promoters to highlight such stations on the route which would be suitable for cyclists to safely enter and exit the Crossrail service.

Government Response

- 6.3 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. A copy of the updated Information Paper is provided at Annex D.

7 Great Western Allotment Association

Committee Decision

We ask the Promoter to prepare and till the new site for the allotment. We expect 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. That means electricity, water and footpaths. We expect the Promoter also to enter into meaningful discussion with the Association as soon as practicable to agree the terms of such services and facilities. In terms of facilities, that may mean the odd shed and greenhouse.

Government Response

- 7.1 The Promoter will require the nominated undertaker to provide the replacement temporary allotments in a condition fit for use as allotments for planting in the next planting season; this will 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.
- 7.2 The Promoter will also require the nominated undertaker to provide members of the Great Western Allotment Association (GWAA) who are 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 is practicable to do so, to relocate their existing facilities.
- 7.3 Furthermore, the Promoter will also 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.
- 7.4 The Promoter has spoken with the GWAA, and the GWAA has confirmed that the nature of the services and facilities that the Promoter is proposing to provide at the replacement temporary allotments meet with its approval. The GWAA has also confirmed that it does not wish to be provided with electricity at the temporary allotments, and the London Borough of Ealing has stated that it is not typically its policy to provide electricity for allotment holders. As a result, the Promoter does not intend to provide electricity to the temporary allotments.

- 7.5 The Promoter is committed to maintaining an ongoing relationship with both the GWAA and the London Borough of Ealing in the run-up to, and during, construction.

8 Spitalfields Community Association and others

Committee Decision

We note that Crossrail has taken action to engage an independent charity, Planning Aid for London, to facilitate the meeting to appoint representatives to the local liaison panel. We are grateful to Crossrail for the action taken to comply with our recommendation and we are glad that the local liaison panel is to have an ongoing relationship with Crossrail using the facilitation of the local authority. We note that it is now for the panel to consider how it wishes to operate and take this forward.

Government Response

- 8.1 The Promoter notes the Committee's comments, and repeats its commitment to maintaining an ongoing relationship with both the established Spitalfields community liaison group and the London Borough of Tower Hamlets in the run-up to, and during, construction.

9 GE Pensions

Committee Decision

We agree with the Petitioners that they should have the option of entering into an Over-Site Development Agreement with the Promoters. We were encouraged to hear that further discussion will take place between the two parties on this issue and we now ask the Promoters to ensure that such an agreement is offered to the Petitioners.

Government Response

- 9.1 The Promoter can confirm that it has offered to enter into a collaboration agreement with GE Pensions in respect of 354 to 358 Oxford Street and 1 Marylebone Lane, and will now proceed to negotiate the terms of the agreement.

10 London Borough of Havering

Committee Decision

We re-emphasise the need for recognising disability-friendly policies and we are grateful to the London Borough of Havering and Crossrail for the re-design of the station to ensure that passengers can access the building readily. We

remind the Promoters that 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.

Government Response

- 10.1 The Promoter is committed to the creation of an inclusive transport system and, where reasonably practicable, has made stations fully accessible. All newly-built stations in the central tunnel section of the route will provide step-free access from street to platform level.
- 10.2 The Committee will recall that in 2006, further consideration was given to the number of stations that were to be upgraded to provide step-free access in light of the Department for Transport's 'Access for All' initiative. As a result, an additional four stations on the north-eastern section of the line – namely Forest Gate, Goodmayes, Gidea Park and Harold Wood – have been added to the list of stations that are proposed to be upgraded. Crossrail will now provide independent, step-free access from street level to the platforms in both directions at 28 of its stations.
- 10.3 This means that, across the route, it is expected that 93% of all passenger trips on Crossrail will start and end at a Crossrail station with step-free access from street to platform level.
- 10.4 The selection criteria for upgrading existing stations has been based on the projected passenger numbers at the station, the capital cost to upgrade to step-free access, and the distance to the nearest accessible station. Where step-free access is not available, the proposal is that dignified, alternative arrangements or auxiliary aids will be employed.
- 10.5 Work to provide an inclusive transport system will continue throughout the life of the project. It is proposed that 'Design and Access Statements', addressing accessibility issues, will be submitted in support of relevant applications for the approval of details made of qualifying local authorities under the planning regime established in Schedule 7 of the Bill. In this way, issues of importance to people with restricted mobility will be taken into account as an integral part of the detailed design development.

11 Paddington Residents Active Concern on Transport

Committee Decision

The Committee recognises that the residents of Brewers Court will be affected by the Bill. We ask the Promoters to provide a liaison officer to actively make contact with the residents and assist them with issues during the construction phase of the project.

We also ask Crossrail to adopt the model recommended by the Committee in relation to the Spitalfields residents to establish a local liaison group which

would include local residents and local community leaders who will then be able to liaise with Crossrail throughout the construction period.

Government Response

- 11.1 The Promoter can confirm that a dedicated community liaison point of contact for the Paddington area will be assigned in due course, and that the local community will be notified of the relevant contact details nearer to the start of construction.
- 11.2 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 is pleased to report that a consensus on a way forward that fits the needs of the area has been established, and that the first meeting of the local liaison group will be in November.

Committee Decision

We are also concerned about the combined effect of Crossrail and the congestion zone in this area on the people who live within it and travel through it. This area will be placed at the edge of the congestion zone and within a busy construction area for Crossrail.

We strongly ask that the Promoters liaise with the Mayor of London and Transport for London to seek a sensible way forward on this matter with a view to a temporary or permanent alteration to the boundary of the congestion zone to accommodate more friendly and sustainable use of the area. We ask the Promoters to report on what progress has been made on this issue when they respond to the Committee in the autumn.

Government Response

- 11.3 The Promoter has discussed the possibility of relocating the Congestion Charging Zone (CCZ) boundary at Paddington with both Transport for London (TfL) and Westminster City Council.
- 11.4 The discussions have looked at both relocating the boundary temporarily during Crossrail construction, and permanently relocating it. TfL has raised no objection in principle at this stage to either the temporary or permanent relocation of the boundary, but further survey and modelling work is likely to be required to assess the impacts at Paddington and consequential impacts over the wider area before it can offer an informed view. Westminster City Council has also indicated that it would have no objection to either the temporary or permanent relocation of the boundary to Westbourne Terrace and Sussex Gardens.

11.5 Any relocation of the boundary is a matter for TfL. The Promoter is committed to continuing its discussions with TfL and Westminster City Council to ascertain whether the CCZ boundary can be relocated.

12 London Borough of Tower Hamlets

Committee Decision

The Borough appeared on 13 March to raise several issues. The Committee was satisfied with the response given by the Promoters. However, the Committee agrees that the existing Astro turf pitch at the Stepney Green worksite is of benefit to the local community and should be kept on a permanent basis if possible and we strongly encourage the two parties to liaise on this matter and find a solution.

Government Response

12.1 At the time that the London Borough of Tower Hamlets appeared before the Committee the pitch was proposed to be used as a worksite, and the Promoter had offered the London Borough of Tower Hamlets an undertaking that, before the pitch was used as such, an alternative pitch to their reasonable specification would be provided elsewhere in Stepney Green park.

12.2 The Promoter subsequently met with the London Borough of Tower Hamlets in April to discuss proposals for a ninety degree rotation of the existing pitch, which would allow sufficient space to remain for the required Crossrail worksite. This would mean that the pitch would only be unavailable for the time needed for the reorientation – estimated at being around three months – rather than require the loss of the existing pitch and the provision of an alternative pitch elsewhere in the park, as had been originally proposed. The Promoter also asked the London Borough of Tower Hamlets if there is a time of year when the pitch is less well used, in order that it can be attempted to arrange the proposed closure to coincide with this period.

12.3 The London Borough of Tower Hamlets is still considering the proposed rotation of the existing pitch. If it does not accept this proposal, then the undertaking referred to above, in respect of the provision of an alternative pitch elsewhere in the park, will apply.

13 Westbourne Park Villas Residents Association

Committee Decision

We are content with the Promoters' response regarding the concrete batching plant. We note that Crossrail has followed the Committee's request to make their south side of the footbridge DDA compliant. Whilst we accept that it is not Crossrail's responsibility to replace the bridge, we would ask the Promoters to go further in making the current bridge accessible to those with restricted

mobility. We ask the Promoters to develop sensible engineering design solutions and use mirrors and good lighting to enable those using the footbridge to view oncoming persons.

We would also like the Promoters to explore the use of traffic light systems and simple signage to show people with restricted mobility if another wheelchair/ pushchair user is approaching.

Government Response

- 13.1 The Promoter will require the nominated undertaker to provide appropriate lighting and, if their use is 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 are able to see people approaching in the opposite direction.
- 13.2 In addition, if the access issue for people with restricted mobility cannot be resolved – such as to allow two wheelchairs to comfortably pass on the southern spans of the footbridge (which the Promoter does not propose to rebuild) – the Promoter will 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 enters the footbridge in order to warn people approaching from the opposite direction.

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

Committee Decision

We accept that the Petitioners currently face an uncertain level of disruption during the construction of the Isle of Dogs station. We would ask the Promoters to clarify at the earliest opportunity which construction scenario they intend to follow.

We accept that Crossrail will take steps to mitigate the disruption of the Petitioners and recognise that if there is a case for compensation, the code set out in the Bill will apply. We expect that this matter may be considered by a committee in the other place when there is greater clarity over the construction scenario.

Government Response

- 14.1 Construction arrangements are continuing to be developed for this station. As soon as it is possible to determine with certainty the choice of construction scenario, it will be made known.
- 14.2 The Promoter will be taking this work forward with Canary Wharf Group. The Committee maybe aware that Canary Wharf Group has recently offered a

significant contribution to the project and will, once arrangements are confirmed, be responsible for the delivery of the Isle of Dogs station.

15 Canary Wharf Group PLC

Committee Decision

We recognise that these Petitioners would also appreciate greater clarity on the future of the construction project. We are not in the position to offer them a great deal of comfort; however, we have 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 believe that this limit should only allow one extension of a further five years. What is more, Parliament should approve such an extension only if it can be demonstrated that it is necessary. We ask the Promoter to amend the Bill accordingly.

Government Response

- 15.1 In response to the concerns of the Committee (having listened to, among others, Canary Wharf Group PLC), the Promoter agrees to limit the power in the Crossrail Bill that provides for an extension of the period during which compulsory purchase order (CPO) powers may be used.
- 15.2 The proposed amendment, which is provided at Annex E, means that under Clause 6(7) an extension of CPO powers can only be made once, and that such an extension could be for no more than five years.
- 15.3 With regards to parliamentary approval, currently, under Clause 6(8) of the Bill the CPO powers can only be extended by the Secretary of State by a statutory order subject to ‘special parliamentary procedure’.
- 15.4 Special parliamentary procedure is particularly relevant in cases where land and property is subject to compulsory acquisition, and where there is a need for the renewal of such powers to be subject to thorough scrutiny. This is achieved through a demanding process, which includes:
- i the laying of the special procedure order before Parliament by a Minister, along with a certificate stating that various preliminary proceedings have been complied with;
 - ii a 3 week period for objectors – such as those whose land and property is concerned – to petition against the order or in favour of amendments;
 - iii a 3 week period for any Member of either House to move that the order be annulled;
 - iv if the order is not annulled, the referral of the petitions to a Joint Committee, which may approve the order, with or without amendments, or decline to approve it;

- v the introduction of a Public Bill if the order is reported with amendments that are not accepted by the Minister, or if the order is not approved by the Committee.

15.5 The Promoter consequently believes that the existing special parliamentary procedure process will not only provide suitable safeguards to protect those affected by Clause 6(7) – by means of giving petitioners the right to be heard – but will also allow for an exceptionally high level of scrutiny by Parliament, as encouraged by the Committee’s words on this matter.

16 Trustees of the SS Robin Trust

Committee Decision

We understand 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 would ask Crossrail and the Department for Transport to write letters of comfort to the lottery board explaining the current situation and ensure that the ship does not lose out on possible funding due to the uncertainty of its relocation.

Government Response

16.1 The Promoter has discussed this issue with the trustees of the SS Robin and, at their request, has provided them with a letter of comfort for them to use with third parties as they see fit. The Promoter has also written to the petitioner to further explain the compensation arrangements that would apply in their case.

16.2 The Promoter reiterates to the Committee that, in order to minimise the impact of the construction of Crossrail upon the activities of the SS Robin, it is fully committed to using reasonable endeavours to procure alternative moorings for the SS Robin within the West India Dock complex during construction. The Promoter is committed to ongoing liaison with the SS Robin Trust, and with British Waterways and Canary Wharf Group, to this end.

17 Residents of Poplar Dock

Committee Decision

We are delighted 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 agreeable solution. We are grateful to all involved in these discussions. This community deserves to be safeguarded during the construction period. We would encourage Crossrail to continue meaningful dialogue with the Petitioners.

Government Response

- 17.1 The Promoter is pleased to have found a solution that is welcomed by the petitioners, and recognises the need for further discussion with the boat users, British Waterways and Canary Wharf Group during consideration of the detailed construction arrangements.

18 Citipost AMP Limited and Mr Daniel Albert Charlesworth

Committee Decision

On Tuesday the Committee heard the case of the only Petitioner appearing against the fourth set of additional provisions. We agree that the Petitioner's case is unique and that they have been considerably disadvantaged by the new provisions. We welcome the Petitioner's support of the Crossrail project and note the positive attitude with which he has embraced the works forced upon him. We also recognise that the Petitioner has experienced financial loss and whilst we accept it is usual that during the process of hybrid bills that parties pay their own costs, we intend to make an award in this unique case without prejudice.

We ask the Promoter to prepare to pay the Petitioner half the costs he incurred during the negotiations of AP3. We ask the Petitioner to prepare a list of reasonable costs incurred for the Committee. We will examine this when the Committee returns in October with a view to allocating half the cost against the Promoters.

Government Response

- 18.1 In view of the Committee's conclusion that the petitioner's case is unique, the Promoter is prepared to pay half of the reasonable costs that the petitioner incurred in negotiating the proposals that were incorporated in the third set of Additional Provisions deposited in November 2006.
- 18.2 The Promoter has been in correspondence with the petitioner, and can confirm that it has agreed a schedule of costs.

19 Woolwich

Committee Decision

Finally, we come to Woolwich. We are pleased that the Secretary of State followed the request of the Committee and brought forward the necessary provisions to build a station at Woolwich. However, we have been concerned about the cautionary language used by the Promoters when bringing forward this additional provision. Therefore, we encourage the Promoters to do all they can to make this station a reality. 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. Therefore, we reiterate our view that the station at this site must remain central to the Bill.

Government Response

- 19.1 The Promoter continues to recognise that there is a strong case for a station at Woolwich, and is pleased to have found a clear way forward that can deliver a station at Woolwich without adding to the costs of Crossrail already identified.
- 19.2 The Promoter is currently in negotiations with Berkeley Homes to finalise the detailed agreement under which Berkeley Homes will construct the station box at Woolwich. Discussions have been complicated by the need to involve the current freeholder of the land at Woolwich, the London Development Agency, but it is expected that matters will be concluded in the early autumn.
- 19.3 The agreement will set out the specification of the station box and the timetable for its construction, as well as putting into legally binding terms the financial and other arrangements contained in March's outline agreement. Consideration of the arrangements to fit out the box as a station is expected to commence as soon as the station box agreement has been signed.
- 19.4 The Promoter believes that the Committee can be confident that Berkeley Homes and the London Borough of Greenwich will have the right incentives to develop a deliverable proposal for raising the necessary private sector funding for the station at Woolwich.

Annex A

Floating slab track – tunnels 15 metres or less below residential buildings

- 1 Once the detailed design stage is completed and the precise vertical alignment of the Crossrail tunnels has been finalised, the buildings below which floating slab track will be installed pursuant to the undertaking given in paragraph 2.1 will be determined as follows:
 - i all buildings that comprise at least one part residential will be included;
 - ii the depth will be calculated to the nearest part of the tunnel lining and not just the tunnel crown (the top of the tunnel);
 - iii the depth between the tunnel and the building will be taken from the nearest part of the tunnel lining to the building foundations;
 - iv it will be assumed that building foundations reach to 2.5 metres below ground level.

- 2 By way of illustration only, applying these criteria to the current tunnel alignment has identified five distinct locations with a total of 137 residential buildings to which this undertaking would apply:
 - i three buildings adjacent to Paddington station;
 - ii 96 buildings between Soho and Holborn;
 - iii 36 buildings near Grove Hall Park;
 - iv one building at Victoria Dock portal;
 - v one building in North Woolwich.

- 3 Revised groundborne noise modelling, using an assumed floating slab track design, has been carried out to show the predicted reduction in noise levels that the installation of floating slab track (FST) would deliver at the residential buildings at the locations identified above. The modelling has assumed that FST would be installed approximately 50 metres in both directions of the tunnels either side of the residential buildings, and so more than these buildings would experience reduced groundborne noise levels. Illustrative results are shown below:

i Paddington

Address	Approximate distance to tunnel lining (metres)	Groundborne noise level from standard trackform (dBL _{Amax,S})	Groundborne noise level from FST (dBL _{Amax,S})
18 Spring Street	14.5	25	18

ii Soho and Holborn

Address	Approximate distance to tunnel lining (metres)	Groundborne noise level from standard trackform (dBL _{Amax,S})	Groundborne noise level from FST (dBL _{Amax,S})
St. Giles Court, St. Giles High Street	13.5	28	15
190 High Holborn	11.5	32	21
4 Southampton Row	12	32	27
11 Denmark Street	14.5	29	26
62 Neal Street	12.5	29	16
11 Macklin Street	11.5	32	18

iii Grove Hall Park

Address	Approximate distance to tunnel lining (metres)	Groundborne noise level from standard trackform (dBL _{Amax,S})	Groundborne noise level from FST (dBL _{Amax,S})
48 Wrexham Road (Emma Jeffery)	12.5	33	20
1 Baldock Street (Barbara and Tony Wheeler)	8.5	32	19
36 Ridgedale Street	13.5	29	16

iv Victoria Dock Portal

Address	Approximate distance to tunnel lining (metres)	Groundborne noise level from standard trackform (dBL _{Amax,S})	Groundborne noise level from FST (dBL _{Amax,S})
1-21 Foster Court, Victoria Dock Road	14.5	29	23

v North Woolwich

Address	Approximate distance to tunnel lining (metres)	Groundborne noise level from standard trackform (dBL _{Amax,S})	Groundborne noise level from FST (dBL _{Amax,S})
171-209 Albert Road	11	30	24

Notes: 1. The Crossrail operational groundborne noise design criterion for residential buildings is 40 dBL_{Amax,S}.
 2. Not all 137 residential buildings are listed. The addresses shown for each location are illustrations of the approximate predicted reduction in groundborne noise levels that the installation of floating slab track (FST) would deliver at residential buildings at the location.

Annex B

Floating slab track – all Crossrail running tunnels

Introduction

- 1 This paper explores the cost and practicability of installing floating slab track (FST) as the permanent track support system in all Crossrail running tunnels.

Cost summary

- 2 A detailed explanation of how the cost estimates were calculated is attached, as is a summary cost table. All costs are at 1Q 2002 prices.
- 3 The cost of providing the sections of FST identified as being likely to be required in the Crossrail Environmental Statement (ES) by applying the proposed Crossrail design criteria was given in evidence on Day 11 of Committee (9 February 2006) as approximately £7m. A further estimate was also provided on Day 11 for the cost of the additional sections of FST that would be required to meet the more stringent design criteria proposed by the London Borough of Camden, that being approximately £6.3m in addition to the £7m cited above. Based on the figures and assumptions used to calculate the costs given on Day 11, the cost of providing FST for the entire route is £70.7m.
- 4 The figures used to calculate the costs given on Day 11 were based on an assumed FST system. There are various types of FST system currently available. Each type of system has its own particular costs related to the technology that it is based on, as well as the specific installation requirements and related maintenance issues. Since February 2006, a further high-level review of the FST options for Crossrail has been carried out by CLRL. The system that is most likely to be used in the Crossrail running tunnels has been further investigated and the costs for the provision of this – which compare with the £70.7m figure given above – are as follows:
 - i for tunnels in the Soho area, between £4.4m and £4.8m;
 - ii for tunnels that are 15 metres or less below residential buildings, £6m;
 - iii for all Crossrail tunnels, between £128.4m and £139.3m.
- 5 However, these figures do not take account of the fact that some form of trackform must be provided for the trains to run on, irrespective of whether it is FST or not. Consequently, the marginal costs (that would be over and above what would have to be spent on a trackform in any event) of providing FST are as follows:
 - i for tunnels in the Soho area, between £2.2m and £2.5m;
 - ii for tunnels that are 15 metres or less below residential buildings, £2.9m;
 - iii for all Crossrail tunnels, between £62.5m and £73.4m.

- 6 Finally, if the fact that it has always been assumed that some FST would be provided is taken into account, as well as the decisions to install FST in the running tunnels in the Soho area and those that are 15 metres or less below residential buildings, the true marginal cost of providing FST in all Crossrail tunnels would be between £53m and £62m.

Non-cost issues

- 7 The installation of a proven trackform technology, be it a standard trackform or some form of FST, is unlikely to present any insurmountable problems in terms of engineering or construction practicability. As technological advancements are made, new trackforms and installation techniques may become available. The Promoter has confirmed that if, prior to the detailed design development of the Crossrail permanent track support system, a better trackform technology than FST becomes available, then its use will be considered.
- 8 The Promoter continues to believe that the additional cost of £52-63m of installing FST in all Crossrail running tunnels does not represent good value for money. This is because, as the expert witness for the Promoter, Mr Thornley-Taylor, made clear in his evidence to the Committee, the blanket provision of FST would deliver no benefit to receptors located above the tunnels, either because FST would have been installed in any event (if they triggered the proposed Crossrail design criterion), or because the noise levels they would have received using the standard trackform would not have materially affected them. Indeed, certain sections of the route do not require noise attenuation from any form of FST – for example, where there are no sensitive receptors above the tunnels (for instance, above the tunnels underneath the Thames, or beneath Hyde Park) or where the tunnels are, by any objective standard, at considerable depth.
- 9 For these reasons, notwithstanding the fact that the Promoter has accepted the Committee's decisions in respect of installing FST in the running tunnels in the Soho area and those that are 15 metres or less below residential buildings, the Promoter continues to believe that the better approach, rather than commit to the use of a particular trackform technology now, is the one that it has adopted – namely, the giving of a commitment in terms of the design criteria for the performance of the railway for sensitive receptors.

Floating slab track – detailed explanation of cost estimates

Costs cited in Committee on Day 11¹

(a) Cost of FST per kilometre

- 1 The total cost of providing FST was given as £1.493m/km. This was made up of £933,000/km for the cost of the floating slab track itself and an additional £500,000/km for indirect costs and contingency costs.
- 2 The cost of providing standard, non-FST, track was given as £1.064m/km.

(b) Cost of providing the required FST identified in the Crossrail Environmental Statement (ES)

- 3 This cost was based on the proposed length of FST identified in the Crossrail ES, the associated technical reports, and from examination of particular buildings along the route. This gave a requirement for 4.711km of FST. Therefore the total cost given of providing FST based on this requirement was approximately £7m (4.711km x £1.493m/km).
- 4 Clearly, some form of trackform must be provided for the trains to run on, irrespective of whether it is FST or not. Given the rate set out in paragraph 2 above, the cost of providing standard non-FST trackform for the same distance is approximately £5m (4.711km x £1.064m/km). Consequently, the marginal cost (that which would be over and above what would have to be spent in any event) of providing FST based on the ES information is approximately £2m (£7m FST - £5m standard).

(c) Additional cost associated with meeting the London Borough of Camden's proposed design criterion

- 5 Following an analysis of the route using the proposed Camden design criterion there was a requirement for an additional 4.2km of FST. The total cost therefore of this additional requirement was given as £6.3m (4.2km x £1.493m/km).
- 6 The cost of providing standard non-FST trackform for the same distance is approximately £4.5m (4.2km x 1.064m/km). Consequently, the marginal cost of providing the additional FST required is £1.8m (£6.3m FST - £4.5m standard).

Using the Day 11 assumed FST costs to calculate FST costs

(a) Costs for the provision of FST for the tunnels in Soho

¹ See paragraph 3132 onwards of the Select Committee transcript for Day 11 (9 February 2006)

- 7 The Soho area is defined as being between Regent Street and the eastern extent of the Crossrail Tottenham Court Road station (Charing Cross Road). Using the figures given above, the cost for providing FST for the tunnels in the Soho area is £2.4m (1.63km x £1.493m/km).
 - 8 The cost of providing standard non-FST trackform for the same distance is approximately £1.7m (1.63km x 1.064m/km). Consequently, the marginal cost of providing FST through Soho is £0.7m (£2.4m FST - £1.7m standard).
- (b) *Costs for the provision of FST for the entire route in tunnel*
- 9 Using the figures given above, the cost of providing FST for the entire route in tunnel is £70.7m (47.38km x £1.493m/km).
 - 10 The cost of providing standard non-FST trackform for the entire route in tunnel is approximately £50.4m (47.38km x £1.064m/km). Consequently, the marginal cost of providing FST for the entire route in tunnel is £20.3m (£70.7m - £50.4m).
 - 11 However, there is a further consideration to take into account when calculating the marginal cost of providing FST for the entire Crossrail route in tunnel. As noted in paragraph 4 above, it was always assumed that some FST would be provided at a marginal cost of approximately £2m. Consequently, the true marginal cost of providing FST throughout the Crossrail tunnels would be approximately £18.3m (£20.3m - £2m).

Developments since Day 11: high level review of FST options

- 12 Since Day 11, further work has been done to assess the different options in terms of floating slab track systems that are currently available. Two particular, recent rail projects have been investigated and both provide up-to-date information, including costs, with regard to the floating track systems used. These are the Channel Tunnel Rail Link (which used an advanced resilient rail support system throughout and no FST at all in its tunnels) and West Rail, Hong Kong (which did use FST).
- 13 The most likely system to be used in the Crossrail tunnels is similar to that of West Rail (which included an FST system of pre-cast concrete sections mounted on resilient pads) and it comprises the following levels of standard, non-FST and FST trackform in its construction, depending on the sensitive receptors above the section of tunnel in question:
 - i Level 1: pre-cast sections fixed to the concrete tunnel lining (non-FST)
 - ii Level 2: pre-cast sections with resilient pads placed between them and the concrete tunnel lining
 - iii Level 3: resilient pads between the tunnel lining and pre-cast sections with an increased mass

Using the currently assumed FST costs to calculate latest FST costs

(a) *Costs for the provision of FST for the tunnels in Soho*

- 14 The standard, non-FST trackform described as the first level above is estimated to cost approximately £1.39m/km or £2.3m (1.63km x £1.39m/km), using the definition of the Soho area given above. The cost of providing the second level of trackform is £2.71m/km or £4.4m (1.63 km x £2.71m/km). The cost of providing the third level of trackform is £2.94m/km or £4.8m (1.63 km x £2.94m/km). It is expected that lengths of the second and third levels of attenuation described would be used depending on the sensitivity of the receptors above the tunnels, and this cannot therefore be clearly defined as yet. Therefore the likely total cost of providing FST for the tunnels in Soho will be between £4.4m and £4.8m.
- 15 The marginal cost of providing FST through Soho calculated using this more recent data is therefore between £2.1m (Level 2 FST cost minus standard cost (£4.4m - £2.3m)) and £2.5m (Level 3 FST cost minus standard cost (£4.8m - £2.3m)).

(b) *Costs for the provision of FST for tunnels 15 metres or less below residential buildings*

- 16 The standard, non-FST trackform described as the first level in paragraph 13 is estimated to cost approximately £1.39m/km or £3.1m (2.2km x £1.39m/km) for the length of FST identified as a result of the decision to provide FST for tunnels 15 metres or less below residential buildings (“the 15 metre decision”). The cost of providing the second level of trackform is £2.71m/km or £6m (2.2 km x £2.71m/km). The marginal cost of providing FST to meet the 15 metre decision is therefore £2.9m (Level 2 FST cost minus standard cost (£6m – £3.1m))

(c) *Costs for the provision of FST for all commitments on FST to date (Soho and the 15 metre decision) and proposed length of FST in the ES*

- 17 The standard, non-FST trackform described as the first level in paragraph 13 above is estimated to cost approximately £1.39m/km or £10.1m (7.241¹km x £1.39m/km) for the length of FST identified as a result of the Soho and the 15 metre decisions, as well as for the length of FST assumed in the ES. The cost of providing the second level of trackform is £2.71m/km or £19.6m (7.241km x £2.71m/km). The cost of providing the third level of trackform is £2.94m/km or £21.3m (7.241 km x £2.94m/km). Therefore the likely total cost of providing FST for the tunnels to meet these three requirements will be between £19.6m and £21.3m.

¹ Approximate length of FST required in kilometres, taking into account overlapping FST areas.

18 The marginal cost of meeting the FST requirements described above is therefore between £9.6 (Level 2 FST cost minus standard cost (£19.6m - £10.1m)) and £11.2m (Level 3 FST cost minus standard cost (£21.3m - £10.1m)).

(d) *Costs for the provision of FST for the entire route in tunnel*

19 The first level of trackform described above (non-FST) is estimated to cost approximately £1.39m/km or £65.9m if provided throughout the tunnels. The second level of trackform described above (FST) is estimated to cost approximately £2.71m/km or £128.4m. The third level will cost approximately £2.94m/km or £139.3m throughout the tunnels. It is expected that lengths of each of the three different trackforms would be used depending on the sensitivity of the receptors above, and this cannot be clearly defined as yet. However, if FST is provided across the entire route, comprising a mixture of level 2 and level 3, it will cost between £128.4m and £139.3m.

20 The marginal cost, therefore, of providing FST throughout the tunnels would be between £62.5m (Level 2 FST cost minus standard cost (£128.4m - £65.9m)) and £73.4m (Level 3 FST cost minus standard cost (£139.3m - £65.9m)).

21 Finally, as in paragraph 11 above, to reach the true marginal cost account must be made of the fact that it was always assumed that some FST would be provided as set out in the ES, and FST will now be installed in the tunnels in the Soho area and those that are 15 metres or less from residential buildings, at a marginal cost of approximately £9.6m (£19.6m - £10.1m) for Level 2 FST and £11.2m (£21.3m - £10.1) for Level 3 FST. Consequently, the true marginal cost of providing FST in all the Crossrail running tunnels would be between £53m (£62.5m - £10.1m) and £62m (£73.4m - £11.2m).

Floating slab track – summary of costs

Type of trackform	Costs from February 2006 ¹ (£m)	Latest estimated costs ¹ (£m)
Standard trackform per kilometre	1.064	1.39
FST per kilometre	1.493	2.71 (Level 2) 2.94 (Level 3)
Total FST (Crossrail ES)	7	12.8 (Level 2) 13.9 (Level 3)
Total FST (including LB Camden)	13.3	24.1 (Level 2) 26.2 (Level 3)
Total cost for Soho decision ²	2.4	4.4 – 4.8
Marginal cost ³ for Soho decision	0.7	2.2 – 2.5
Total cost for 15 metre decision	3.3	6 (Level 2)
Marginal cost for 15 metre decision	0.9	2.9 (Level 2)
Total cost of ES FST, Soho and 15 metre decisions ⁴	10.8	19.6 – 21.3
Marginal cost of ES FST, Soho and 15 metre decisions ⁴	3.1	9.6 – 11.2
Total cost for entire tunnel route	70.7	128.4 – 139.3
Marginal cost ³ for entire tunnel route	20.3	62.5 – 73.4
True marginal cost ⁵ for entire tunnel route	18.3	53 – 62

Notes: 1. All costs are at 1Q 2002 prices, including contingency.

2. The Soho area is defined as lying between Regent Street and Charing Cross Road.

3. Cost of installing FST minus cost of installing only standard trackform, therefore providing an indication of the additional cost of providing FST.

4. Figure adjusted for overlaps in defined areas, estimated to be 7.241 kilometres.

5. Cost less cost of assumed FST in ES.

Annex C
Undertaking to Eleanor Ferguson

The same form of undertaking will be given to Mona Hatoum and Gerald Collins, and Caroline Hamilton.

IN PARLIAMENT
SESSION 2006-7

CROSSRAIL BILL
UNDERTAKING
TO
ELEANOR FERGUSON

In consideration of Eleanor Ferguson refraining from further opposition to the Crossrail Bill I hereby undertake on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport ("the Secretary of State") that the following provisions of this undertaking shall have effect:-

1. In this undertaking:

"the Bill" means the Crossrail Bill first introduced into Parliament on 22nd February 2005;

"the Hanbury Street Shaft" means the shaft at Hanbury Street forming part of the Works;

"the Petitioner" means Eleanor Ferguson;

"the Property" means the leasehold interest of the Petitioner in the property known as Floor 2, 61 Princelet Street, London E1 5LP;

"the Works" means Works Nos. 1/3A and 1/3B as defined in the Bill.

2. The Secretary of State will, within 14 days of Royal Assent to the Bill, write to the Petitioner notifying her that she may request in writing the purchase of the Property.

3. If after receipt of the notice referred to in clause 2 the Petitioner, at any time before completion of the Hanbury Street shaft, requests the purchase of the Property, the Secretary of State shall proceed as soon as reasonably practicable to purchase the Property on the same terms as if the Property had been acquired compulsorily under the powers of the Bill.

4. Any dispute as to the amount of compensation payable shall be referred to the Lands Tribunal for determination.
5. This undertaking shall cease to have effect if at any time before a request is made by the Petitioner under clause 3, the Secretary of State writes to the Petitioner undertaking not to construct the Hanbury Street shaft as part of the Works.
6. The benefit of this undertaking is personal to the Petitioner and cannot be assigned to any other person.

Annex D Information Paper E2 – ‘Cycle Carriage and Cycle Parking’

Information Paper E2 – CYCLE CARRIAGE AND CYCLE PARKING



1. Introduction

1.1 This Information Paper outlines the policy of the Crossrail Promoters with regard to on-train cycle carriage. It also outlines a Crossrail-wide cycle parking policy. It is consistent with the approach adopted in the Transport Assessment Reports (in Volume 8 of the Crossrail Environmental Statement), which in turn is consistent with local, regional and national transport policy.

1.2 Increasing emphasis is being placed on reducing reliance on the private car as a mode of transport whilst simultaneously accommodating economic growth and the attendant increase in demand for travel. This requires the promotion of alternative modes of transport; cycling is increasingly recognised as a method of achieving this policy objective at a local level.

2. Cycle Parking (Non-Central Section Stations)

2.1 It is expected that a higher proportion of passengers will use bicycles to reach the rail network by 2013. In many cases, additional cycle parking facilities will be installed at Crossrail stations before Crossrail is operational. Crossrail will seek to provide additional cycle parking where Crossrail services lead to a significant increase in passenger demand.

2.2 Cycle parking facilities will generally take the form of stands under cover, with good lighting and CCTV coverage wherever practicable. Appropriate signage will be provided and designs will seek to incorporate the following features:

- be as close as possible to a station entrance;
- provide safe and direct access to the local road and cycle networks;
- be open and visible, allowing natural surveillance; and
- be well signed-posted.

2.3 Whilst open access Sheffield stands¹ are expected to meet the requirements of most users, the potential for closed access facilities, such as cycle lockers, will be explored further as detailed station designs are developed.

3. Cycle Parking (Central Section Stations)

3.1 High passenger volumes and constricted space availability combine to preclude provision of dedicated cycle parking facilities at Crossrail stations in the central area.

3.2 The nominated undertaker will work with stakeholders who are responsible for

¹ A Sheffield stand is an inverted u metal ring set in concrete – they are recommended by Transport for London and others for use in the railway context and are generally regarded as the standard type of bicycle stand for most uses.

delivering such facilities on adjacent sites. This includes sites within the wider station curtilage at stations such as Paddington where facilities currently exist. Such existing or planned facilities should be accessible to Crossrail passengers not only by appropriate signage but also through wider information and publicity.

4. Cycle Carriage on Trains

- 4.1 The final policy on cycle carriage on Crossrail will be a matter for the Train Operating Company (TOC) responsible for the railway at that time. Crossrail is not currently in a position to be able to make commitments on the final cycle carriage policy that would be adopted by the TOC in the future. The project shares most subsurface stations with LUL and the working assumption is that there will be a ban on cycle carriage at all times between Acton Main Line and Stratford/Abbey Wood. Cycle carriage will be allowed on all other sections of Crossrail, but with peak hour restrictions as appropriate. Decisions on the restrictions on cycle carriage will be the subject of detailed development. A Crossrail route map showing these provisional arrangements, and based on TfL's existing Cycle Carriage Map for the London Underground, is attached.
- 4.2 Crossrail trains are likely to include areas of flexible space within each train. This would be prioritised for the use of wheelchair users. However, it would combine wheelchair space with the capacity to carry prams, bicycles, other oversize luggage and standing passengers. Restrictions are likely to be required on the carriage of tandems and tricycles, depending on the final configuration of rolling stock.

Annex E
Amendment to Clause 6

Clause 6, page 3, line 39, at end insert:

“() The Secretary of State may only exercise the power in subsection (7) in relation to any land –
(a) once, and
(b) so as to extend the period under subsection (6) by not more than 5 years.”