

Crossrail 2  
PO Box 72284  
LONDON SW1P 9PB



6 January 2016

Dear CR2 Team

## **CROSSRAIL 2 PROPOSALS: SECOND CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

Having had more time to consider and discuss the CR2 consultation material since the Society's original response of 8 November, we consider that it would be useful to the Crossrail (CR2) Team if we set out in rather more detail, some of the principal issues that we feel need to be addressed.

We then go on to suggest the ways in which alternative designs could be worked up for a more technically-based evaluation, prior to the next round of consultations.

Both the current layout, and the whole construction process, have very major implications for both the local environment and economy, and there is the potential for causing a very considerable amount of damage and disruption.

The current CR2 leaflets are so basic that the implications for Wimbledon cannot be properly understood. A deeply considered scheme should contain more drawings and descriptive material, and would cover all the potential options, not just one.

Producing sketches of ideas at a very early stage for public involvement is to be welcomed, but the current approach seems to have been "this is the design we have decided is the best, and the alternatives are not as good". It goes without saying that this approach is not accepted.

What has been presented so far is not yet technically adequate, and consequently it is difficult to extract any precise conclusions other than that there will be significant commercial and environmental disruption in the area during the construction phase.

Wimbledon is obviously a highly strategic transport location, commercially very important, and if it were to be disabled or put out of action there would be a knock-on effect which would affect businesses and income for many London areas, including central London.

Any scheme for CR2 in Wimbledon would have to go through, under, over or to the sides of the existing station. There is no other technical way, unless one avoids the Wimbledon area altogether.

There is no clarity about how the existing five (four to/from Waterloo plus Thameslink) lines will meet up with or join the new CR2. How does the link-up work at Raynes Park? The Thameslink line south of the Station seems to have been obliterated by the CR2 tracks. The CR2 lines also cut across the Thameslink line to the northeast. As the present CR2 alignments do not allow this Thameslink service to function, this appears to be a major design flaw.

Also, will the present railtracks in Wimbledon station need to be re-aligned to accommodate the CR2 trains? How will future increases in passengers be catered for?

No cross-sections were presented showing how the new multi-level Wimbledon station will function, nor if new buildings are proposed on top of the 'new' station complex to integrate it into the town centre, and perhaps generate income.

The opportunity for an essential and proper integration of rail and all the other public transport modes into a single transport complex is seemingly ignored.

The indication that the present outdated Station building and concourse would be retained, and have some minor works carried out, is seen as somewhat bizarre.

It fails to deal with the need to provide a full scale modern transport hub complex.

CR2 should not be seen as a stand-alone project, but rather as an opportunity to create an integrated public transport hub at the centre of the town.

Architecturally, a highly innovative design approach should be expected, as has been done with the Jubilee Line extension stations, and of course CR1.

It would be revealing and informative to be given the alternatives that TfL considered, how many there were, how they were evaluated, and why they were not taken further.

**We suggest how this might be approached in the second half of this letter.**

One option for example would be to start a tunnel west of Raynes Park station.

Were ideas about a Crossrail tunnel under the current station considered and rejected? With a tunnelled solution there would be fewer night-time working restrictions.

As the Crossrail booklet says, building from the surface would be more disruptive and cost more.

The principal design concept needs to be spelled out more clearly.

Which has priority, the linking of many local stations, such as Clapham Junction and Balham, or providing a fast rail link through to the centre of London and beyond.

The deviation of the line into Balham or Tooting needs to be more clearly explained.

If something like the current scheme were to be suggested, where is the information about how the existing rail/tube services into and out of Wimbledon will be juggled?

How are services to/from Waterloo to be restricted? Is future expansion possible?

Where are the cost assumptions discussed for compulsory purchase of properties and businesses? The welfare of the many smaller local businesses which will be displaced is ignored. They, unlike major chains, cannot easily move elsewhere, and without specific help and support, may fold, probably never to return.

Little information is provided about the future planning of the town centre, and how the new station/transport complex will link in to the future town centre.

It is as though the rail scheme has been designed in isolation, with no thought given to how it can be integrated into the life and fabric of the town.

The financing of the whole project also needs to be developed further.

Not only the initial costs (acquisitions, compensation/relocation, construction etc), but to what extent new development and uplift are to make a future financial contribution.

Will a CIL levy be in place (as for CR1) across London and other affected areas?

The existing road bridge over the tracks and leading to the Broadway (apparently three old bridges side by side) has multiple supports astride the various tracks.

This rail crossing is a vital and somewhat vulnerable part of our local road system. Should not a new single span bridge be an integral part of the CR2 station and transport complex, on an alignment that takes traffic away from the Broadway, allowing it to be pedestrianised?

The proposed new road bridge between Alexandra Road and Queen's Road should be designed to accommodate bus and cycle routes, as well as facilitating options for the traffic circulation in the wider town centre, and perhaps gaining access the station itself.

Putting it in place at an early stage would support the phased alterations to the existing bridge and to the town centre's traffic during the build phases.

The re-routing of the statutory undertakers' equipment such as gas, electricity, phone lines, broadband, secure banking lines, fibre optics cables, water, sewers etc will be a major part of the project during the construction phases.

The proposal in the Council's Plan for a district heating CHP scheme will introduce an additional need, and it would be expected that a new transport hub complex (and major developments over and around the tracks) would be an integral part of such a scheme.

The bringing in and the disposal of construction materials over several years is a major exercise, which cannot be allowed to impinge on the local small scale road system without causing a great deal of environmental damage.

Any construction plan therefore should have as one of its major components a rail-based work site, with a dedicated rail line to handle the great majority of this work, and linked to a depot well outside the built up area.

Little mention is given to coordinating/re-routing of bus routes into and out of Wimbledon while CR2 goes ahead. Also, will the tram level crossing at Dundonald and Kingston Roads be affected, and how will the Tram stop at the Station link through to the other transport modes? The opportunity for a future extension of the tramline out of the Station to the north east should be catered for.

In order for there to be a rational public discussion of the various options, it is suggested that the next stage of public consultation should be informed by technical studies taking into account the following.

### **ASSUMPTIONS**

That the CR2 tracks are at an appreciably lower level than the existing tracks. Preliminary information is that they are 10m below “road level”, meaning that the future Station and transport complex will have to cater for pedestrians at least 4 levels, being: the present concourse, Alexandra Road, present platforms, and future CR2 platforms.

Depending on the design options, the CR2 tracks could be lower than the quoted 10m.

Also, that the size of the CR2 platforms “box” (containing the two tracks and the central platform between them) is about 250m long and assumed to be perhaps 30m wide.

(Note that 250m is the distance currently occupied by the working sites C and D and E).

**THE IMPLICATIONS** for each alternative design would include:

- Land take, with acquisition and demolition costs
- Identification of temporary working sites and the “mother” depot
- Potential for future development and income generation
- Financial cost of construction
- Town centre disturbance assessments and costs during construction
- Re-housing/relocation and compensation costs of present occupants/businesses
- Ability to create an integrated transport hub with all modes (CR2, current rail, tube, bus, tram, taxi etc) all on the same site, and linked to the Council’s future Plan.

Only when each alternative design is drawn out and evaluated in this way can we be clear about the choices. The current design assumes a “take it or leave it” approach, and without other schemes for comparison does not allow evaluation: this is not an adequate basis for consultation.

### **QUESTION ONE: Where should the ‘box’ be located?**

There seem to be 6 options:

1. To the south of the present tracks/platforms, as shown in the current CR2 layout
2. Beneath the present running tracks
3. North of the present main line rail tracks, and under the Tube tracks
4. North of all the track systems, beside Alexandra Road
5. To the southwest of the road bridge, ie down the line, with only one end of the platforms being connected in to the present Station platforms/concourse
6. As 5, but within a whole new station and transport complex, built down the line from the present one, ie reverting broadly to the position of the Station when the railway was first built.

### **QUESTION TWO: Where should the working sites be?**

1. As now proposed by CR2
2. More to the north, up to Alexandra Road/St George’s Road, leaving Centre Court intact & functioning
3. More towards Raynes Park, leaving alone some of the present Station area with its sensitive town centre implications

### **QUESTION THREE: Where should the tracks enter the tunnel?**

1. As now proposed by CR2, close to Gap Road
2. Further down the line towards Raynes Park
3. To the Southwest of Raynes Park.

### **QUESTION FOUR: Where should the turning, train stabling, repair depot, be?**

1. As now proposed by CR2 in Weir Road and Dundonald Road
2. Site H (Gap Road) and site J (Dundonald Road) and Rainbow site in the Raynes Park triangle
3. The Rainbow site in Raynes Park and perhaps another to the southwest

**QUESTION FIVE: What are the implications/proposals for the Raynes Park Station and its attendant tracks and the Rainbow site?**

And for the properties beside the railway between Raynes Park and Wimbledon?

1. Current sketches do not show how the CR2 tracks “emerge” from the present track layouts to the southwest of Raynes Park: nor how the works would impinge on what now exists. This kind of information should be regarded as essential.
2. There is an opportunity to rebuild the out-dated Raynes Park Station, utilising two levels rather than three. A street level concourse would link the two halves of the shopping centre, and allow for the removal of the high level footbridge.

**CONCLUSION**

This important scheme of public works should be progressed in a more positive way, with the public playing an important and creative part in its evolution.

Whilst this discussion of an initial layout is to be welcomed, the current proposal appears deeply flawed, and is not seen as a clear option for the future.

To progress this important public works project, it is suggested that we need to see:

1. A well designed modern transport hub incorporating all the public transport facilities, at the heart of the town centre, dispensing with the present out-dated Station:
2. A number of alternative design/layout options, evaluated and compared so that the public can be an informed part of the CR2 design process:
3. A scheme that will minimise damage to the town centre’s economy and environment over the 10 year build period, and maintain good rail services in place throughout:
4. A process for evolving the CR2 scheme that brings the public (as well as the Council and other public bodies) into the creative design process, not only via formalised “consultations”.

Yours faithfully

John Mays  
Chairman, Planning Committee

Copies to  
Council:  
Network Rail:  
TfL:  
Mayor of London:  
Chamber of Commerce:  
Love Wimbledon:  
Stephen Hammond MP:  
Richard Tracey GLA:  
WURA