

*Via email: [crossrail2@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:crossrail2@tfl.gov.uk)*

**Date: 08/01/2016**

Dear Sir/Madam,

**RE: Crossrail 2 Consultation**

I am writing in response to the consultation on Crossrail 2.

The London Assembly Liberal Democrats are strong supporters of Crossrail 2. We acknowledge the challenge that Transport for London faces to ensure that London's transport network keeps up with projected demand over the coming decades, and we applaud the ambition this scheme shows in meeting that challenge.

We are pleased with the commitment that all Crossrail 2 stations will have step-free access and consider this to be an essential requirement. It is vital that ensuring step-free access at every station on the route, from the first day of operation, is taken into account as work on the project moves forward.

We are concerned by the recent reports regarding the potential heritage impact of the Crossrail 2 proposals. Where it is necessary for Crossrail 2 to develop listed or historic buildings, creative solutions should be found to keep the heritage impact to a minimum.

We would like to know more about what will happen to the spoil removed during construction and request that as far as possible it is removed by rail as opposed to by road. This is particularly the case for areas which could suffer from heavy levels of construction, such as Wimbledon. We were pleased with the imaginative use of spoil from Crossrail 1 for landscaping projects, such as the Wallasea nature reserve. We hope Crossrail 2 will find similarly productive ways to use spoil.

Turning to the route, we are aware of some controversy regarding some of the station locations and related issues. In general we are concerned that where Crossrail 2 will interlink with existing metro rail services there should be no loss of existing services, including in terms of the frequency with which stations on the route are currently served. Crossrail 2 must improve on existing services.

Chelsea

We agree that there are clear transport benefits for the King's Road area, but recognise also that the campaign against having a station in the area does raise some valid concerns, such as the loss of land needed for the modernisation of the local hospitals. It seems clear that the alternative station locations for Chelsea are not viable on the grounds of cost and/or slowing down journey times. We think that either there should be a station on the King's Road, or no station in Chelsea

at all. Given that not having a station in Chelsea would save a significant sum of money and speed up the line, we remain open-minded on this point. If the consultation shows that the residents of Chelsea are clearly opposed to having a station, then perhaps the money could be spent on improving the scheme in other locations instead.

#### Wood Green or Turnpike Lane/Alexandra Palace

We prefer the Turnpike Lane and Alexandra Palace station route over the Wood Green route. Alexandra Palace needs enhanced transport links due to the large events held there. Turnpike Lane would benefit from regeneration opportunities and has very good interchange due to the bus station there. We are also concerned about the impact of the shaft on Downhills Recreation Ground, required if the route goes to Wood Green.

#### Tooting Broadway or Balham

While we recognise that Tooting Broadway has greater need and potential for regeneration than Balham, we accept that there are very significant construction difficulties with the Tooting Broadway option. We also recognise that Balham would have a good interchange with metro rail services as well as the tube. Therefore we would support Balham if it really is the only viable option, but suggest a close look at the long term benefits before making a final decision.

#### Wandsworth Common

We are concerned about the impact of the proposed vent shaft, which seems unacceptably high. We urge Crossrail 2 to look very carefully at other options and also at mitigating the impact if there are no viable alternatives.

#### Streatham

We request that Streatham is seriously considered as an option for a Crossrail 2 station. There are clear transport and regeneration benefits from doing so. Perhaps it could be funded by not having a station in Chelsea.

#### Wimbledon Station

The current proposals need careful thought as they appear to be too damaging and undermine the projects aim of regenerating local areas. If the station could have deep tunnelling as opposed to the currently proposed shallow option, much of the damage could be avoided. If this is not viable then the proposals should be reworked to retain the current character and community of the local area and to minimise the impact on the local economy, as far as is possible.

#### Motspur Park Station

We are concerned that the increase in frequency in rail services going through this station will significantly undermine the viability of the current level-crossings. We understand that roads in the local area already suffer from serious congestion, which would be exacerbated by this change. Ways of mitigating this impact need to be considered and we request that a thorough local consultation be carried out on this issue.

#### Worcester Park – Epsom

We support the inclusion of the Worcester Park to Epsom line in the project and in particular welcome a Crossrail 2 station at Worcester Park.

#### Norbiton – Shepperton

We are concerned about the suitability of Hampton Wick as a terminus for some of Crossrail 2 services on this line. We understand that using Hampton Wick in this way would require the loss of wild shrub land for the construction of sidings, which would be regrettable because of its

environmental impact on the 'green chain' alongside the railway line. It would also end the prospect of having a cycle path alongside the railway line between Teddington and Hampton Wick, which was proposed as part of LB Richmond's 'mini-Holland' bid. We suggest that Teddington would be a better option as the terminus. We also ask that you consider the option of starting some services at Strawberry Hill, which already has a depot that could be used.

#### Surbiton – Waterloo non-stopping service

We are concerned that changes to the metro rail services in South West London that result from Crossrail 2 could involve an end, or a reduction to the non-stopping service from Surbiton to Waterloo. We request that there is no such reduction unless there is a firm evidence base to show that Crossrail 2 would more than make up for this (or any other) decrease in capacity.

Further to this point, for lines that are switching entirely to a Crossrail 2 service or seeing a reduction in their non-Crossrail 2 service, we would be reassured by a more thorough analysis of likely journey patterns matched with predictions of Crossrail 2 capacity, particularly at key interchanges.

#### South West London (general)

Where the project requires works along sidings in South West London, we request that effective noise mitigation measures for local residents are put in place.

We remain very supportive of Crossrail 2 overall, and we look forward to the opportunity to contribute to future consultations on the regional route options.

With best wishes,



**Caroline Pidgeon AM**

Leader of the London Assembly Liberal Democrat Group