



CROSSRAIL INFORMATION PAPER

C5 – ADDITIONAL SAFEGUARDING

This paper sets out the position on additional safeguarding, for extensions of Crossrail to Reading in the west and to Ebbsfleet in the south-east.

It will be of particular relevance to those interested in the route development process.

This is not intended to replace or alter the text of the paper itself and it is important that you read the paper in order to have a full understanding of the subject. If you have any queries about this paper, please contact either your regular Petition Negotiator at CLRL or the Crossrail helpdesk, who will be able to direct your query to the relevant person at CLRL. The helpdesk can be reached at:

Crossrail
FREEPOST
NAT6945
London
SW1H 0BR

Email: helpdesk@crossrail.co.uk
Telephone: 0845 602 3813

C5 – ADDITIONAL SAFEGUARDING

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Although there are currently no plans to extend the scope of Crossrail beyond that for which powers are being sought in the Crossrail Bill (the Bill), Ministers announced on deposit of the Bill their intention to safeguard a route between Abbey Wood and a proposed new station at Ebbsfleet (safeguarding directions for the route to Ebbsfleet were issued on 24 February 2005), and to consult on the possibility of safeguarding an extension from Maidenhead to Reading.
- 1.2 During summer 2005 the Department for Transport consulted local authorities on additional safeguarding for both extensions.
- 1.3 The purpose of further consultation was to prepare updated safeguarding of land east of Abbey Wood and to enable local authorities to present their case for safeguarding a route to Reading.

2. Abbey Wood to Hoo Junction

- 2.1 Local authorities were consulted during autumn 2004 on proposed safeguarding for the south-eastern limb of the Crossrail route. This included the section between Abbey Wood and Ebbsfleet, which at that time formed part of the Crossrail project for which a Bill was being prepared.
- 2.2 In November 2004, it was decided that Crossrail would terminate at Abbey Wood. The key factor in the decision not to extend Crossrail to Ebbsfleet was that the reliability of North Kent rail services is such that a robust interlinking Crossrail service could not be guaranteed. Information Paper A5, Abbey Wood to Ebbsfleet provides further information about the decision to terminate services at Abbey Wood. Safeguarding directions were issued on 24 February 2005, just after the Bill's introduction, to protect the route, and discussions began on how to resolve the operational difficulties that led to the section being dropped from the Bill. It should be noted that the eastern extremity of the safeguarded land is in fact some miles further east of Ebbsfleet at Hoo Junction sidings, where stabling facilities are proposed.
- 2.3 Cross London Rail Links Ltd (CLRL) advised that in order to achieve a reliable service, four-tracking of the line would be required between Slade Green and Dartford. In order to provide four-tracking, additional land outside of the current safeguarding would be required and a new safeguarding direction replacing that issued on 24 February 2005 would be necessary. The Department for Transport amended the draft safeguarding plans to enable the construction of the revised track layout between Slade Green and Dartford and further design development of the proposed layout of Hoo Junction sidings.
- 2.4 Redesign at Hoo Junction has been undertaken because the land currently subject to consultation is almost all agricultural land in private ownership with a high potential for significant archaeological remains. The location of the sidings as previously proposed would present some inconvenience to freight operators.

The revised proposal is to use less land, the overwhelming majority of which is in railway ownership, with a relatively small part in private agricultural use.

2.5 Four local planning authorities were consulted in 2005; the London Borough of Bexley, Dartford and Gravesham Borough Councils and Kent County Council. The consultation included:

- draft safeguarding plans illustrating the revised safeguarding limits; and
- draft safeguarding directions, with accompanying guidance notes updating the 24 February safeguarding directions.

2.6 Generally the consultation responses received were in favour of revising the safeguarding directions to Ebbsfleet but a few issues were raised about the potential impact of the draft safeguarding plans on future local developments.

2.7 The decision to issue the revised safeguarding directions was deferred following an instruction by the House of Commons to the Commons Select Committee to, where it considered appropriate, consider any petitions on the extension of Crossrail to Ebbsfleet (and Reading) and to report to the House whether there was a case for the extension to be made by an order under the Transport and Works Act 1992. The Committee heard evidence but did not make any recommendation on these matters in its Special Report, published on 23 October 2007.

2.8 In January 2008 the Department met with CLRL and relevant local authorities to discuss the issue further and will make an announcement regarding this in due course.

3. Extension to Reading

3.1 A wide variety of route options were considered as part of the Review of the Crossrail Business Case, July 2004¹. Crossrail will have a western terminus at Maidenhead. This is believed to offer the widest possible benefit to travellers into and out of London from the West. Information Paper A6, Selection of the Western Termini gives further information. The purpose of the consultation in summer 2005 was to give local authorities along the railway corridor between Maidenhead and Reading the opportunity to present their case for safeguarding the route for Crossrail.

3.2 In consultation with Network Rail, CLRL has prepared indicative draft safeguarding plans for potential works between Maidenhead and Reading. The plans serve to illustrate the area that would be subject to consultation were a route to be safeguarded.

3.3 Three local planning authorities were consulted; Reading Borough Council, Wokingham District Council and the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead. The consultation:

¹ Available on the Department for Transport website; www.dft.gov.uk

- asked the local authorities to comment on whether, in principle, land along the railways corridor between Reading and Maidenhead should be safeguarded in order to facilitate a possible extension of Crossrail to Reading;
- included indicative safeguarding plans, setting out the proposed limits of land that would be subject to any safeguarding; and
- made clear that no decision to safeguard a route for Crossrail should be inferred by the consultation or any commitment to extend Crossrail services beyond Maidenhead.

3.4 As with Ebbsfleet, generally the consultation responses received were in favour of safeguarding land along this corridor but a few issues were raised about the potential impact of the draft safeguarding plans on future local developments.

3.5 The decision to issue safeguarding directions was deferred following an instruction by the House of Commons to the Commons Select Committee to, where it considered appropriate, consider any petitions on the extension of Crossrail to Reading (and Ebbsfleet) and to report to the House whether there was a case for the extension to be made by an order under the Transport and Works Act 1992. The Committee heard evidence but did not make any recommendation on these matters in its Special Report, published on 23 October 2007.

3.6 In February 2008 the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Transport, Mr Tom Harris MP, decided to safeguard additional land between Maidenhead and Reading. While it is clear that Crossrail services will terminate at Maidenhead and have no plans to extend them to Reading, this measure gives the flexibility to be able to extend Crossrail in the future, should there be a business case. This safeguarding of the route would also protect the possibility of undertaking electrification works on the route to Reading, even without the extension of Crossrail. Again, this keeps this option available should a decision be taken to electrify the railway beyond Maidenhead.

3.7 The decision to safeguard is subject to consultation with CLRL, Network Rail and relevant local authorities on detailed safeguarding plans. Most land needed is already within the railway estate and the proposal is to safeguard only such additional land as is necessary (for example works sites adjacent to bridges that need to be raised) so as to minimise the impact on adjacent development.

4. Conclusion

4.1 On 6 February 2008 the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Transport, Mr Tom Harris MP, in a Ministerial Statement to the House, announced that he had decided to safeguard additional land between Maidenhead and Reading for Crossrail. It should be made clear that Crossrail services will terminate at Maidenhead and there are no plans to extend them to Reading, but safeguarding gives the flexibility to be able to extend Crossrail, should there be a business case in the future.

4.2 The Department for Transport is still considering updating the safeguarded route to Ebbsfleet and will continue to discuss this matter with CLRL and the relevant local authorities. The Department will make an announcement regarding this in due course.