



20 JUN 2016

Mike Brown MVO
Commissioner of Transport

The Rt Hon Greg Hands MP
Member of Parliament for Chelsea & Fulham
House of Commons
London
SW1A 2AA

Transport for London
Windsor House
42-50 Victoria Street
London SW1H 0TL

Phone 020 3054 8900
mikebrown@tfl.gov.uk

16 June 2016

Dear *Greg*

Crossrail 2 & Imperial Wharf

Thank you for your letter of 11 April asking for further clarification and explanation of TfL's analysis of a potential Crossrail 2 station at Imperial Wharf. I am sorry for the length of time taken to respond.

Following the letter I sent you on 24 March, Michele Dix, Managing Director of Crossrail 2, provided further information in a letter to you on 1 April. The information in this letter builds on the information provided in previous correspondence.

Crossrail 2 has been designed to address a number of strategic transport challenges in London and the South East, and in doing so, will support areas of potential housing growth, job creation and improve travel across the region. This case has been recognised by the National Infrastructure Commission and the Government who have endorsed Crossrail 2 as a priority investment for London and the South East. They have also asked us to consider potential options for improving the affordability of Crossrail 2, including reviewing the case for all stations.

We have recently updated our analysis of the case for a station at Imperial Wharf, comparing it with a station at King's Road or no station between Clapham Junction and Victoria. When looking at the transport case for a station at either King's Road or Imperial Wharf, our analysis of public transport accessibility levels demonstrate that a station at King's Road would provide a greater boost to local accessibility than an Imperial Wharf station. The benefits of a King's Road station would be felt across a wider area and would increase public transport accessibility levels in an area where connectivity is very poor given its proximity to central London. This would provide local people with significant journey time savings when travelling to important employment destinations like the City of

London, Canary Wharf and the West End. Our analysis found no significant difference in projected passenger numbers or crowding relief: passenger demand at either station would be very similar (with more entries at Imperial Wharf but more exits at King's Road) and differences in crowding relief to the District line would be marginal.

When considering the economic case, a station on the King's Road would best serve the businesses clustered on the King's Road including the largest employers in the area such as the major hospitals. This would support employment growth in an already important commercial centre. While our analysis suggests that an Imperial Wharf station could support more homes than the King's Road (around 2,000 at Imperial Wharf, 1,000 at King's Road), this must be considered in the context of the overall number of new homes that Crossrail 2 could unlock (200,000) and the benefits of serving major employment centres and businesses on the King's Road.

An alignment via Imperial Wharf would also introduce significant additional costs both to build and operate the scheme (c. £300m including the required risk allowance) and would result in longer journeys for thousands of passengers travelling through the station as the overall route is longer. This would make Crossrail 2 less attractive to passengers across the South East, ultimately undermining the case for the project, as well as adding additional costs at a time when we are being asked to make savings. Recent work has also confirmed that an alignment via Imperial Wharf would require additional maintenance given the tighter curvature of the railway to realign with Clapham Junction and would also require a ventilation shaft in the King's Road area. This would impact residents and businesses around the King's Road and would mean an Imperial Wharf alignment would be unlikely to address concerns about the impact of the scheme in the local area.

No decisions have been taken and we are working to determine how best to deliver the £4bn savings requested by Government whilst designing a more affordable railway that meets our strategic objectives. We will continue to work closely with stakeholders and the local community as we progress through scheme development and further refine the case for Crossrail 2.

Yours sincerely

Mike Brown


Mike Brown MVO



HOUSE OF COMMONS

LONDON SW1A 0AA

Mr Michael Stephen
Flat 3, Whitelands House
Cheltenham Terrace
London
SW3 4QX

30 June 2016

Dear ~~Mr Stephen~~, *Michael*,

Crossrail 2 in Chelsea & Fulham

I am writing to provide an update on the prospect of Crossrail 2 coming to the constituency of Chelsea & Fulham.

As you will know from my previous correspondence, I am a longstanding supporter of Crossrail 2 in general. Since my meeting with the then Mayor of London on 29 June last year, I have urged City Hall and Transport for London (TfL) to consider the feasibility of alternatives to a station on the King's Road.

TfL's most recent consultation on Crossrail 2 ran from 28 October 2015 to 8 January 2016. Throughout this period I received daily written correspondence, emails, and telephone calls conveying strongly held opinions in response to TfL's proposals. I have written to several hundred constituents on Crossrail 2 over the last year, in an effort to determine whether my constituents and local stakeholders would prefer a Crossrail 2 station on the King's Road, at Imperial Wharf, at Fulham Broadway, or not at all.

Most recently, on 11 April I wrote once again to Mr Mike Brown MVO, Commissioner of TfL, asking for a more detailed explanation of the metrics and strategic objectives relating to the proposals for a Crossrail 2 station in my constituency. The reason I wrote yet again was that it seemed to me that the case for a station at **Imperial Wharf** rather than on the King's Road - in terms of the building of new homes; growing the local economy through the creation of jobs; and tackling crowding, congestion, and connectivity - presents a more preferable case for my own constituents rather than people living in other areas of London and the South East of England.

I received a response from Mr Brown dated 16 June, in which he states that the benefits of a station on the King's Road would be felt across a wider area with higher local accessibility. However, as with the previous responses I have received, Mr Brown reiterates that there would be **more entries at a station at Imperial Wharf, but more exits on the King's Road.** Accordingly, I believe it is clear that a Crossrail 2 station at Imperial Wharf would be more useful for my own constituents commuting to work, but **less useful** than a station on the King's Road for people coming into the constituency from outside.

Mr Brown also reiterates that a station at Imperial Wharf would support **more new homes than a station on the King's Road.** However, the figure of **1,000** new homes on the King's Road, as cited by Mr Brown, is at odds with the recent figure of 3,500 new homes worth a



total of £6bn as stated by the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea's Executive Director of the Planning and Borough Development Business Group, Mr Graham Stallwood, at the London Real Estate Forum on 14 June. I shall seek clarification of this discrepancy.

As you may be aware, TfL published the initial results of its consultation at https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/crossrail2/october2015/user_uploads/crossrail2autumn2015consultation.pdf, and it has reiterated its commitment, not only to responding to the issues raised in the consultation by the end of June, but also to holding a further consultation on the project in the autumn.

This Consultation Report shows that Question 20, which invited comments on the proposals for a Crossrail 2 station on the King's Road in Chelsea, received the largest number of responses - 4,183 more than Balham in second place. I have included a copy of the map of respondents' postcodes in order to show the strength of the response received from Chelsea & Fulham. Indeed, the consultation received 14,716 comments on the station proposed for the King's Road, with 12,637 respondents (86 per cent) expressing concerns and raising issues, compared with the 1,601 (11 per cent) who support the proposals.

In light of Mr Brown's further comments, I feel not only that Imperial Wharf should continue being seriously considered as an option for a Crossrail 2 station, but that it might even be the preferred site for such a station in the constituency of Chelsea & Fulham.

Yours sincerely,

The Rt Hon. Greg Hands MP
Member of Parliament for Chelsea and Fulham



THE CHELSEA SOCIETY

Rt. Hon. Greg Hands MP
House of Commons,
London SW1 A 0AA

handsg@parliament.uk, stroudr@parliament.uk

13th July 2016

Dear Greg,

CROSSRAIL 2

Thank you for your letter of 30th June, enclosing a letter dated 20th June which you had received from Mike Brown MVO, Commissioner of Transport. We were pleased that you were able to attend our Summer Party yesterday.

The Chelsea Society fully supports Crossrail 2, but the crucial issue for us is whether the route from Clapham Junction to Victoria should or should not be diverted so as run under Chelsea with a station in the Kings Road, and if so, what impact it would have on the character of Chelsea and its quality of life.

The Society has set out on its website at <http://chelseasociety.org.uk/response-to-tfl-consultation-crossrail2/> its reasons for opposing a station on the Kings Road, and for those reasons we ask for your support as our MP. We have also now received the response of TfL dated 7th July 2016 to their consultation, and the Society will be responding to this in due course.

In response to the letters from yourself and Mr. Brown, we would make the following points:

COST

On three occasions Mr. Brown mentions the need to make savings, including reviewing the case for all stations. TfL have advised that it would cost nearly a billion pounds to divert the line from Clapham Junction to Victoria via Chelsea and build a station in the King's Road. This is a massive sum of money by any standards, and especially at a time when there is so much pressure for extra funding of the NHS and other public services. The Chelsea Society does not consider that this expenditure is justified.

In addition, many millions of pounds would be required for repairing buildings affected by settlement and compensating for noise, vibration, odours, fumes, smoke and artificial light. In addition, another unquantified sum – likely to be many millions of pounds - would be lost to local people and businesses due to the inevitable disruption caused by construction works.



THE CHELSEA SOCIETY

We would ask you to oppose a station in the Kings Road in your capacity as a Treasury Minister. It would save no less than a quarter of the £4bn cost saving that the Government is asking TfL to make. Would you be willing to receive a small delegation from the Society at the Treasury?

IS THERE A NEED FOR A STATION ON THE KINGS ROAD?

According to a comparison prepared by TfL for the Mayor of London in October 2015 the overall public transport benefits of the direct route from Clapham Junction to Victoria would be greater than having a station in Chelsea. This is because journey-time savings from Clapham Junction to Victoria for the majority would outweigh longer journey-times for those travelling to/from Chelsea.

TfL also think that the direct route would make Crossrail 2 more effective at meeting the objective of relieving the Northern and Victoria lines. The direct route would also relieve Victoria's mainline and tube stations, because many passengers on overground trains from the south would change to Crossrail 2 at Clapham Junction instead of continuing into Victoria. Likewise on their return journey.

No interchange benefits to other railway lines would be achieved at a station in the Kings Road, and there is no potential for urban regeneration around that station as there would be at other points on the Crossrail 2 route. There are no significant areas in the vicinity of the station which have degenerated or suffered from industrial dereliction.

Mr. Brown is mistaken that a Kings Road station would assist local people to travel to the City and Canary Wharf as the line heads north from Victoria to Tottenham Court Road and beyond.

If the principal case in favour of a diversion through Chelsea is to provide the residents and local businesses of Chelsea with improved transport facilities, then the views of those residents and local businesses should weigh heavily on the decision. They do not consider that connectivity is poor, and you point out in your letter that 86% of respondents to the TfL consultation expressed concerns and raised issues about a Kings Road station and only 11% supported it.

Mr. Brown mentions the hospitals, but we do not think that there is a sufficient case for a Crossrail station for the people using and working in the hospitals. South Kensington station is already close to the Royal Brompton and Royal Marsden, but many patients are unable or unwilling to travel to hospital by public transport. Some members of staff would be reluctant to use public transport at night even if greater efforts were made to ensure their personal safety. Patients and staff need better car-parking facilities at or near the hospitals. The proposed station in the Kings Road would not be convenient for the Chelsea & Westminster hospital.

The Royal Brompton representative at the public meeting with TfL on 22nd October did not support the station. On the contrary, he said that vital redevelopment of their facilities would be unacceptably delayed, because the southern part of their land is "safeguarded," and that if the idea of a station in the King's Road is not abandoned soon, it could mean the closure of the hospital in Chelsea.



THE CHELSEA SOCIETY

EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING

There is little or no unemployment in Chelsea and there is no need for another railway station to increase employment or housing here. The problem in Chelsea is not demand for housing, but land on which to build it, and we do not see where the 1,000 dwellings envisaged by Mr. Brown could be built. Even if they could, he says that this figure must be considered in the context of the 200,000 dwellings that Crossrail 2 could “unlock” and in this context 1,000 is not enough to justify spending an extra £1 billion. Most of them would be built anyway if land could be found.

There are very few places where additional housing could be provided anywhere near a Kings Road station. Moreover, the price of land in Chelsea is one of the highest in the world, and a station in the Kings Road would drive up that price still further. Such dwellings as might be built would mostly be sold to the super-rich and would not enable local people to find a home.

Proposals for development by people in the private sector who hope to be able to contribute to the cost of Crossrail out of their expected profits will add further pressure to the demand for development which is already hard to resist. We have no confidence that RBKC would be able to resist it. This is unacceptable to local people, and could seriously damage the character of Chelsea.

CONGESTION

As you will know, the pavements on the Kings Road are often overcrowded and it is sometimes necessary to step into the road. Large numbers of extra pedestrians going to or from a station would make matters much worse. Also, an almost constant stream of pedestrians crossing the entrances to side-streets would back up the traffic in those streets and cause serious obstruction to traffic in the Kings Road as vehicles waited to turn into the side-streets. This would make the buses and all other traffic run more slowly and would make air pollution worse, not better.

IMPERIAL WHARF

A station at Imperial Wharf would be much more useful to local people and businesses than a station in the Kings Road, but TfL have made significant arguments against it. The Chelsea Society would not oppose your efforts to relocate the station there but would not support it because it would involve major tunnelling works under the buildings of Chelsea and a massive ventilation shaft in Chelsea.

In our view, the best option is for the line to run direct from Clapham Junction to Victoria and we would ask you to support that option.

Regards,

MICHAEL STEPHEN
Chairman of the Planning Committee