

**TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT 1992;
PROPOSED CROXLEY RAIL LINK ORDER
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990;
REQUEST FOR DEEMED PLANNING PERMISSION.**

A REPORT BY SAWTAG

- 1 Readers are asked to examine the critically important **STATEMENT OF MATTERS** on the **PROPOSED CROXLEY RAIL LINK TWA ORDER** (Ref App 35).
- 2 This document was issued on the 6th June 2012, D-Day's 68th Anniversary; under the aegis of the previous Secretary of State for Transport Justine Greening MP. She was succeeded by former miner, Patrick McLoughlin in September 2012. The latter has the distinction of sharing a Birthday (30th November) with Sir Winston Churchill.
- 3 Five exceptional matters have intervened since the **STATEMENT OF MATTERS** was issued.
- 4 **(a)** The change in Department for Transport (TWA) leadership, with Inspector A Pykett now reporting to former miner Patrick McLoughlin MP.
- 5 **(b)** Readers should carefully note that this point emerges from the **Statement of Matters** item 5 and its associated note 1. The latter admits:-
- " it is considered that the effects of the [Watford Met.] closure proposals *are relevant* to the [new] Secretary of State's consideration of the merits of the TWA Order application" permitting Inspector Pykett to hear this evidence, herewith, and overarching those matters generally.
- 6 The Watford Met. Station closure Inquiry reported to Boris Johnson the re-elected May 2012 Mayor of London.
- 7 He has an important new cross-boundary policy to acquire the operation of, and integrate lines, such as those to Watford Junction, into his Railway Offshoots of TfL, London Underground Limited (LUL) and London Overground (LO).
- 8 This was specified in the SAWTAG Report supplied beforehand, to the Closure Inquiry on 16th June 2012.
- 9 Therefore it is essential this up-dated, directed to the **Statement of Matters**, enlarged Report is fully taken on board in the Pykett Inquiry; and integrated with the Mayor's new policy to extend London Overground (LO), integrated with London Underground Limited (LUL), in the virtuous ways advocated herewith, as a LO 'breakout' northwards.
- 10 As Highlighted, SAWTAG were party to the separate process of the Watford Met) Proposed Closure Inquiry on 14th June 2012. Caroline O'Neill, of the TWA Orders Office in the DFT during Summer 2012, permitted SAWTAG to submit these Reports as **Late Representations** to the Pykett Inquiry, Apologies are given because these complex matters took much longer than had been anticipated.

- 11 Several representations progressed from TWA to Closure Inquiry, but SAWTAG's is the only one that has progressed in the reverse, from Closure Inquiry.
- 12 **(c)** There is the mighty **matter** of the Legal Challenge and re-run to the West Coast Main Line (WCML) new Franchise.
- 13 Here the First Group might have replaced Virgin Group, with a possible pencilled in date of December 2012. The WCML Franchise overwhelmingly affects Watford, and inherently requires *extra capacity* through the *intended loops*, east and west of the WCML.
- 14 The long-standing pinch-point or bottleneck, in the London End of the WCML, is set out in the "New Deal for Transport – the Integrated Transport White Paper" (ITWP) of 1998 at Annex F – Letter ..., alleviated through paragraphs 3.30, & 3.31, 4.29 (second and third indents) & 4.30 on pages 43 & 44, and 99 respectively.
- 15 However, the far-reaching £9 billions WCML upgrade that concluded in 2008, took away Watford's main line train stops, although shorter distance trains are substituted.
- 16 In the WCML franchise, subject to Legal Challenge and re-run, that is proceeding, additional WCML trains newly running to Blackpool, Boiton, Telford and Shrewsbury are a key requirement.
- 17 Cumulatively with other increases in frequencies and numbers of trains, increasing with the splendid overall general growth of rail traffic, this puts a steadily increasing burden on limited WCML capacity.
- 18 Both of these pressures might result in additional stops at Watford, if the powers that be are vigilant, and aware of their greater responsibilities.
- 19 It is postulated herewith that the required east and west of WCML *loops* are ever more urgently necessary with time.
- 20 **(d)** Somewhat similarly previous Transport Secretary, Justine Greening MP announced in mid-2012, that the Midland Main Line (MML), was to be electrified northwards from Bedford. There is intended to be a fan of electrified routes northwards to Derby and Sheffield, and westwards and eastwards around Derby.
- 21 The MML has invaluable spare peak capacity Londonwards, even though both the WCML and the MML appear on the ITWP Annex F page 162 rail traffic MAP (see paragraph 14).
- 22 The MML is less heavily trafficked than the WCML, and the new electrification will take up some slack. The WCML peak congestion is far longer, and is more intense, than that for the MML.

- 23 Thameslink runs through St Alban's and Luton to Bedford, the present limit of electrification. There is continuing controversy over future Thameslink rolling stock being acquired from, the threatened with closure Bombardier based in Derby; or the current leaders Siemens from Europe.
- 24 **(e)** The Croxley Link is in the broad corridor of the essential future joint interaction of HS-2, its **alternatives**, the West Coast Main Line (WCML) and the Midland Main Line (MML).
- 25 It is a strict requirement in the context of the links between the Pykett Inquiry on the Croxley Rail Link; and the two (WCML franchise rerun and HS-2 alternatives) High Court and other Actions of December 2012; that overarching Corridor studies are set in train.
- 26 This may be forwarded by suitable recommendations, inter alia, in the Pykett Inquiry informing the Secretary of State for Transport.
- 27 It is essential that the wider implications in the planning context, post NPPF on Green Belt grounds, of virtuous established alternatives, are overwhelmingly recognised in the Pykett Croxley Rail Link (CRL) Inquiry. Please see paragraph later in this report.

DISALLOWED DEEMED PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE CRL

- 28 It is highlighted in the '**STATEMENT OF MATTERS**' that the promoters are applying for a TWA Order, and a direction as to deemed planning permission for the Croxley Rail Link provision in the TWA Order. The request herewith is for deemed planning permission **not** to be granted, unless and until the following major criteria are satisfied.
- 29 **A** It is shown beyond peradventure that the TWA Order satisfies ITWP Paragraph 4.165 in properly protecting the corridors and associated Railway Alignments highlighted.
- 30 **B** Positive plans are published that establish within a reasonable period the several '**loops**' derived herewith, to commensurately increase rail traffic capacity on the WCML, connected with the Croxley Rail Link, east and west of Watford Junction Station.
- 31 **C** To better serve Watford F.C. with the "small loop' single platform station, instead of that in the TWA Order.. Please see the diagram supplied at Figure X. This station will resemble the Wembley Stadium with its 1923-1960's excursion 'small loop' station.
- 32 Please note that aggregates were taken by rail from the nearby, at the western junction for Watford, Rickmansworth (Croxley Hall) quarries, to Wembley in order to build both Wembley 'small loop' station, and the Wembley British Empire Exhibition of 1924 and 1925. However, the 'small loop' single platform station advocated at Watford F.C., would be underground under the Allotments with a junction immediately westwards.

- 33 Thus the Watford F.C. 'small loop' single platform station would not be on the surface like its model of Wembley Stadium 1923-1960's; but it would be constructed underground by cut and cover on the 'Allotments' site.
- 34 **D** To ensure long-term safeguards to the route serving Watford (Met) Station. Here it is advocated that the southernmost line descends into a cut and cover tunnel, north of Watford Grammar School. One end of the platform will be at the main building of the Watford (Met) Station. The other (eastern) end of the platform will be close to Watford Grammar School, possibly with a covered pedestrian way in between. This staggered platform might well be reversible, into Watford Grammar School in the mornings, and out from the latter in the evenings.
- 35 The southern existing platform line will be possibly reversible and extended eastwards, so the descending ramp here will be parallel, but staggered about 400 feet. There are a limited number of stations with staggered platforms in this country, to give a good example of how this can be done.
- 36 The northern existing platform line, will be basically unaltered and remain with the station buildings as a beautiful listed station, perhaps called 'CASSIOBURY' in the future.
- 37 **E** Watford West station will be reconstructed basically on its old 1907 Act of Parliament site 'footprint', except in that it will be extended slightly south. The reason for this, is that the above-mentioned stadium Watford Station with its 'small loop' single platform, will have this supplemented by an island platform into the Colne Valley, located near where the erstwhile Watford Stadium (Halt) 1982-1985? for football traffic.
- 38 The three platforms here will be far closer to the adjoining Watford F.C. and major Hospital, so there is **no need** for the new Watford Hospital Station hereabouts, purporting in the TWA paperwork to serve these facilities, but in reality much further away than the virtuous **alternative** advocated herewith.
- 39 **F** Similarly at Croxley Green, it is advocated that there is an island platform, with a track either side of this. Also similarly to Watford West it is postulated that the Croxley Green new island station is for the major part, on the old embankment of the station site footprint.
- 40 There should be an overall plan for all the historic 1912 Croxley Green lands, under the auspices of the 1907 enabling Act of Parliament; perhaps under the viaduct replacing a number of the 200 car parking spaces needed to be moved from the Ascot Road erstwhile site.
- 41 There is intended to be a sharper curve immediately beyond the western platform end to bring the new 'island' Croxley Green Station in line with the new viaduct alignment, leading to Croxley Met Station. Such a curve, possibly of a reverse S configuration, would be no problem to trains, starting or stopping at the curved alignment off the end of the Island form of the Croxley Green (West) Station.

- 42 At the eastern end of Croxley Green Station the island will be extended as far as possible towards the bridges over the Grand Union Canal and River Gade. A cantilever or otherwise structure will form a walkway across from the eastern end of the 'island' platform to Ascot Road, with booking and other station facilities there, also.
- 43 Using the existing alignment, and reutilising as much as possible of the bridges immediately east of the 1912 station at Croxley Green; will both extensively contribute to reducing the cost of the Metropolitan to old LNWR Croxley Rail Link. The cost might well be halved in this way.
- 44 It is highlighted that Ascot Road is a key location in the general framework of the Croxley Rail Link. This is because the dual carriageway widening of Ascot Road severed the final part of the Croxley Green branch in the late 1990's.
- 45 The above-mentioned overarching ITWP Government Policy in 1998 was expressed in the ITWP at paragraph 4.165. Insertions to properly apply paragraph 4.165 to the local situation, are indicated by square brackets [] thus.

PROTECTING ALIGNMENTS

- 46 This topic appears in the ITWP Chapter 4 which is entitled – "Making it – [integrated transport including the Croxley Rail Link, following the disastrous severing of the western end of the Croxley Rail Link by Ascot Road widening], Happen."
- 47 Then, under the heading of "Better Planning" in the vitally important ITWP paragraph 4.165.
- 48 This starts by requiring "better planning protection to those sites and routes (both existing and *potential*) which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen [Rail WCML] choices."
- 49 It is clear the context applies to both railways and canals. The end of the ITWP paragraph 4.165, protecting sites and routes (both existing and potential) for joint rail and water transport will be returned to later in the report at paragraphs 102 to 108.
- 50 This is now highlighted in the wider Croxley Rail Link, amended above to firstly seek significantly less expensive out-turns, and overarch policy for to the Pykett Inquiry.
- 51 Then secondly,
- (i) it also applies fundamentally to specify the West Coast Main Line (WCML) loop via Watford, and northwards, with requisite connections and a dive-under burrowing junction there.
 - (ii) To Bricket Wood, widening where possible and, at least re-instating the passing loop there.

- 52 (iii) To St Albans via the direct line to the old Hatfield branch railway, with necessary lowering and slight deviations to avoid new development, that attempts to thwart Government Policy in the shape of the vital ITWP paragraph 4.165.
- 52 (iv) Reaching St Albans by a connection near where the Hatfield branch railway passed under the Midland Main Line (MML).
- (v) Reaching St Alban's City Station (MML) on the east side, through a railway that is inclined at an upwards gradient from the Hatfield Branch Railway to the MML.
- 53 (vi) Crossing over from the east side of the MML to the west side, at well chosen point(s) between St Alban's City (MML) and Luton Bute Street (Dunstable Branch) Stations. There is an additional possibility of utilising the Luton and Dunstable (GN) Branch where this latter is parallel near Luton Hoo, to gain a dive-under and grade separated junction to ensure suitable capacity.
- 54 (vii) Re-establishing eight sabotaged railway bridges (see article attached) between Luton Bute Street Station and Dunstable, and rescinding the busway. The latter means both that it is not possible to utilise Green hydro-electric clean renewable non-carbon electricity for transport; and ITWP paragraph 4.165 is being thwarted *again* on a critical potential WCML 'loop' route described herewith.
- (viii) In reaching the large town of Dunstable (population 50,000), which has twice lost out on being added to the Thameslink Network; it will be necessary to recover the alignment of the Linslade/Leighton Buzzard to Dunstable branch.
- This will again be done by necessary lowering and slight deviations to avoid new development that attempts to thwart Government Policy in the shape of ITWP paragraph 4.165.
- 55 If commensurate resources can be brought to directly act from (say) the HS-2 corridor studies; then there should be a short loop, like those brought in prominence in this report at Watford and Wembley stadia; and also Darlington and Heathrow.
- 56 (ix) Dunstable needs to be relinked to Linslade/Leighton Buzzard to form the northern end of the described advocated, Watford to Linslade/Leighton Buzzard east of WCML extra capacity route 'loop.' There should also be an east to south connection towards Cheddington, both for freight, and leading via the early 1839 Aylesbury Branch, with a cross-Aylesbury tunnel to form a *west of WCML similar extra capacity route*.

57 **THE WEST OF WCML EXTRA CAPACITY ROUTE**

The latter would be linked directly, utilising the Rickmansworth North Curve, with the Croxley Rail Link. In the south this would require the Bushey to Watford Stadium link being re-established by similar lowering or bridging, with slight deviations from the old route from Bushey directly westwards.

- 58 The west of WCML extra capacity route would thus run between Bushey and Oxhey; Watford Stadium loop, or directly through the River Colne lands; Either immediately via Croxley Rail Link amended new viaduct, to Aylesbury Chiltern Line utilising the Rickmansworth North Curve of 1925, near the River Chess lands - in a pawn to Queen Manoeuvre;
- 59 Or in the medium term from the River Colne lands, utilising under the critical ITWP paragraph 4.165 as above-mentioned, overarching the old 1862 Rickmansworth Branch Railway formation, to join the busy Aylesbury Chiltern Line at Croxley Hall (River Gade lands) via a grade separated junction to ease capacity constraints.
- 60 Please see the point (at paragraph 124 and Alan A Jackson – London’s Metropolitan Railway page 77) relating to underlying approval through 1870s Acts of Parliament for links of this description. They were originally planned to be both in line and connected. After a delay of 140 years it is now time to achieve this link. Finally in addition to the either/or possibility, it is, of course a step forward if both can be implemented immediately together.
- 61 Returning to the Cheddington to Dunstable link specified above, in order to maximise capacity, the crossing of the WCML is to be grade separated utilising (preferably) a bridge or a dive-under. Altogether this would be relatively expensive, it should be carefully planned to form, by good design, an alternative EAST-WEST route to the one through Bedford.
- 62 Readers should carefully note that the Great Train Robbery 1963 site is being dealt with hereabouts. In this vein it is essential that this alternative, which offers much more traffic potential for passengers, is not robbed, to forward an EAST-WEST route that is largely freight orientated and thus ostensibly relatively unremunerative.
- 63 However, if blind prejudice still persists for a lifetime, and tarnishes all future of the Cheddington vicinity of the Great Train Robbery site still; then fortunately there is another good alternative avoiding this.
- 64 If the highlighted Aylesbury cross-town Mini-Crossrail does not eventuate, the specific route would continue through Calvert and Woodford Halse to Rugby.

- 65 It would, of course, use the formation, under the above-mentioned critical ITWP paragraph 4.165, of the Great Central main line, closed unwarrantedly under the Beeching Axe in the 1960's and 1970's. This would give at least six Rugby tracks, rather than the four existing, half as much again, to greatly increase London to Rugby capacity.
- 66 So the initial route would be:-
- Bushey to Oxhey;
Watford Stadium loop, or directly through the River Colne lands;
Via Croxley Rail Link amended new viaduct;
Via Rickmansworth
North Curve;
- 67 Aylesbury;
Calvert;
Woodford Halse;
Rugby, utilising new connections to WCML etc.
- 68 Now the Great Central Main Lines, as will be seen from Alan A Jackson – London's Metropolitan Railway, were built in the late Victorian era, to the very highest standards. Therefore, with limited realignment of curves etc, these GC Main Lines would form a logical (right) part of the 'Y' network of HS-2.
- 69 Consequently Inspector Pykett is required to recommend, in his report to the Secretary of State of Transport, that there is an urgent need for a Croxley Rail Link and beyond **CORRIDOR STUDY** between the HS-2 alignment, the WCML and the MML. This should comprehensively both all modes of transport, recent developments, and rail alternative routes as aforementioned.
- 70 This is in view of the pending High Court Action, timetabled for December 2012, as overarching context for HS-2. Interlinked Proper consideration for well-considered alternatives, especially of the GC Main Lines is necessary, both for the High Court Action, and in detail as above- mentioned in this Croxley Rail Link Inquiry conducted by Inspector Pykett.

THE FOURTEEN 'STATEMENT OF MATTERS' HEADINGS

- 71 This report now returns to the most important '**STATEMENT OF MATTERS.**' There is set out in fourteen points, the **matters** about which the Secretary State for Transport particularly wishes to be informed for the purposes of *his* consideration; of the TWA application and the associated direction as to deemed planning permission for the Croxley Rail Link development. To avoid repetition, cross-references are given to other parts of the Reports where relevant **Matters** are specified.

ONE

- 72 The aims and objectives of, and the need for, the proposed Croxley Rail Link extending the London Underground Limited Metropolitan line from Croxley to Watford Junction ("the scheme").

- 73 The historical development of the various railways involved has been set out in the 'Historical Report,' and readers are requested to examine this companion document.
- 74 Briefly, the Croxley Green LNWR Branch of 1912 terminus, was close to the 1925 line from Croxley to Watford (Met) terminus. There have been long-standing **aims** and **objectives** to join the two, with similar proposals to today's Croxley Rail Link proposal.
- 75 These two were competitive railways, the LNWR being first in the field, and seeking to retain its local ascendancy. There was **no** co-ordination between them, as despite the 1948 Nationalisation of British Railways, they remained in different regions. Neither was affected by the Beeching Axe, as they were high volume London suburban railways.
- 76 As above-mentioned (at F) the Croxley Green station is **reconfigured**, as a double ended island platform. The bulk of this will be on the specific Lands of the 1907 enabling Act of Parliament, which was implemented in 1912. Within the Pykett Inquiry subject to Parliament, there should be an overall plan for all these lands, together with the adjoining bridges over the River Gade and the Grand Union Canals.
- 77 The aims and objectives must be carefully amended to reflect the transfer back, at a much lesser expenditure, of Croxley Green Station to its 1907 Act of Parliament framework and consequent 1912 site.
- 78 In this exercise the Ascot Road station is unnecessary, and must be forthwith removed from the TWA Orders. This will save much expenditure. The method of serving Ascot Road from the double-ended (east end) of the revised Croxley Green Station, is described more fully at F previously.
- 79 There is a more sharply curved deviation from the TWA orders, at ten chains radius, required at the opposite western end of Croxley Green Station, as amended.
- 80 This deviation curve brings the key section of the Croxley Rail Link, back into line with the northern part of the new viaduct alignment. The key advantage is reiterated, that the amended proposals at Croxley Green result in about half the cost, especially so in avoiding any need for Ascot Road Station.
- 81 The aims and objectives involved in the severance of the Croxley Green terminus, by the infamous late 1990's Ascot Road widening; are established as totally against Government Policy, in the form of ITWP paragraph 4.165, as set out in F previously.
- 82 In extending the "**scheme**" of London Underground Limited's Metropolitan line to Watford Junction, please refer to (b) where Mayor of London, Boris Johnson, has a 2012 manifesto pledge to acquire the cross-boundary operation of and integrate lines immediately outside London, in his TfL offshoot of London Overground. This directly applies to the Watford situation. Please also see at (i) the necessity for a dive-under and burrowing junction towards St Albans.

- 83 It is even more vital to have aims and objectives of extending the Metropolitan line beyond Watford Junction, via a burrowing junction as at (west of) Harrow, to St Albans. It was vital in 1912 with the Metropolitan to Watford's Act of Parliament – see the Historical Report; and it is even more vital today in the present processes.
- 84 These **aims** and **objectives** expressed herewith, meld with a “Breakout” of the Metropolitan Line to St Alban’s and beyond. This is best achieved as described above as a Watford – St Albans – Luton – Dunstable – Linslade/Leighton Buzzard and Cheddington for Aylesbury WCML loop and “Breakout.”
- 85 There should be Croxley Rail Link integrated **aims** and **objectives** to sufficiently reflect the ITWP paragraphs 1.33 (BOX) 1.36, 2.25, 2.35 and 2.45 with FOREWORD, taken together cumulatively.
- 86 Respectively 1.33 (BOX) on page 16 requires: “more and better trains; a stronger voice [in the Pykett Inquiry] for the [SAWTAG] passenger ; better interchanges and better connections; and *enhanced networks*.”
- 87 1.36 on page 16 requires: “A major effort to reduce greenhouse gases; greener more fuel efficient [renewable electric train] vehicles;
- 88 better stewardship [see also 1.34] of the nation’s cultural and environmental [river] heritage, [including from ITWP paragraph 4.165, better Croxley Rail Link stewardship of water transport, and consequent green renewable non-carbon hydro-generation of power as advocated.]
- 89 2.25 on pages 25 and 26 requires: “Respond to the challenge [see also 1.36 first indent] of climate change; minimise [as at Croxley Green resited back island platform station] transport’s demand for land;
- 90 limit the visual intrusion caused by transport [through utilising third and fourth rail dc electrification, and not overhead 25 kV AC wiring as on WCML wirescape];
- 91 reduce use of non-renewable materials/energy sources” [or put more simply, increase use of renewable hydro-electric energy sources as is advocated];
- 92 and finally, “ensure that environmental impacts [as they emerge in the reports] are taken *fully* into account in [Pykett Inquiry Croxley Rail Link] investment decisions.”
- 93 2.35 on page 28 requires: “improve the [Pykett Inquiry Croxley Rail Link] in a way [herewith] which recognises the interactions between transport modes, land use and economic development, [in and beyond Watford],

- 94 and provides for a more stable, integrated and strategic background within which [Croxley Rail Link] transport operators and others [SAWTAG and Inspector Pykett] may make [informed Croxley Rail Link] investment decisions.
- 95 2.45 on page 29 requires: produce [in the Pykett Inquiry into Croxley Rail Link] better [rail] public transport with easier, more reliable connections [at Watford Junction, and at Moor Park initially, before through Watford to beyond Rickmansworth trains arise];
- 96 enhance [Croxley Rail Link] public transport networks, [not just by means of the new connection, but also by, parallel to 1.33 (BOX) indents above: future Watford Junction dive-under towards St Albans];
- Restore Bushey and Oxhey to River Colne lands and Watford Stadium direct rail network connections;
- 97 Restore Watford West and Croxley Green stations to their original sites; new single track underground Watford Stadium Station, with subs.
- 98 A future grade separated junction on the Metropolitan main line (see figure), leading to the restored middle section of the LNWR Rickmansworth Branch towards Watford.
- 99 The FOREWORD on the ITWP third page requires:-
It is prominently shown - "The main aim of this [ITWP] White Paper is improving the alternatives" [ie Rail].
Thus extra good alternatives have been derived herewith.
- TWO**
- 100 It is for the promoters to justify their scheme, and because of time and other constraints, these aspects are not covered here. Commentary is only made in two particular aspects here.
- 101 Firstly, regeneration needs to be actual true regeneration. The scheme should be powered by turbines in the furthest west end of a River Colne to River Gade multi-purpose tunnel. This tunnel would start in smaller dimensions at the River Colne, where there would be water intakes, a treatment plant and filters. The basic tunnel is to be virtually level.
- 102 The tunnel would be augmented in size at Watford Junction Station. Here Several railways would join, and the tunnel would become of a suitable size for eventual double-deck trains. Suitable dimensions for the central main part of the tunnel would be 23 feet (7 metres) in size; the same size as a London Underground Station Tunnel, or indeed the same size as the Clock face on 'Big Ben' at Parliament, recently renamed the Queen Elizabeth Tower in view of the Queen's Diamond Jubilee.

- 103 The tunnel would run under Clarendon Road, where a double ended station, with the east end located for easy interchange at Watford Junction Station. There would be a further station centrally in Watford, and the tunnel would on the approach to the 'Cassiobury' station (ex Watford Met), give an upwards connection to the latter, and diminish in size as a level water tunnel only.
- 104 The description of 'Cassiobury' station has already been given at D, and readers are asked to cross-reference there. The now smaller tunnel would be underneath 'Cassiobury,' and it would emerge westwards in the River Gade valley.
- 105 The form of the emergence would be at a unique power station; where the turbines would be located in a turbine hall, and the exterior would have a frontage and size like that of the erstwhile Cassiobury House. This would be mitigation in the Green Belt to re-establish historic buildings in a new use.
- 106 The turbines would be of 'low head' form, resembling those at La Rance Barrage, St Malo, Brittany, France. Here, they can work to heads of 10 feet (3 metres). A decision would have to be made on whether to adopt the virtuous, efficient La Rance pumping turbines, or use only 'line of flow' non-pumping turbines.
- 107 Further mitigation in the Green Belt might re-establish Croxley Mill frontages and dimensions. In any event the leats for the original water wheels that powered Croxley Mill, should be similarly re-established using the specified turbines.
Going to the ITWP the main justifying paragraphs are 1.33 (BOX) to 1.36, 2.12, 2.20, 2.25, 2.35, 2.45, 2.49, 2.52, 3.26 and 4.14. Due to the constraints involved, only a few of the key words will be extracted from the paragraphs involved.
- 108
- | | |
|------------|--|
| 1.33 (Box) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More and better trains; ▪ Enhanced networks; ▪ Stewardship of [water] natural resources; |
| 1.34 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build on Kyoto Protocols to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. |
| 1.35 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We (the previous Government) want to see greener cleaner [rail] vehicles that have less impact on the [Croxley Green and Watford] environment; |
| 1.36 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A major effort to reduce greenhouse gases; ▪ Greener, more fuel efficient [rail] vehicles; ▪ Better stewardship of the nation's cultural and [Green Belt and Rivers Colne and Gade Valleys Protected] Environmental heritage. |
| 2.12 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tackling [road and rail] transport noise; ▪ Improve air quality [by means of the specified non-carbon, non-polluting renewable virtuous, hydro-electric power above]; ▪ Reduce noise [by undergrounding] and vibration from [rail] transport |
| 2.20 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support regeneration [by the above means] and the vitality of [Watford] urban and [Green Belt] rural areas; |

- 2.25
 - Respond to the challenge of climate change [see 1.36 here also];
 - Minimise [rail] transport's demand for land [at Croxley Green by adopting the 1907 Act of Parliament land footprint option in a general plan; and at Watford through undergrounding]
 - Limit the visual intrusion caused by [rail] transport [by extending the use of third and fourth rail dc electrification and not overhead wires; by keeping operational beautiful listed stations such as 'Watford (Met); and the advocated undergrounding];
 - Reduce use of non-renewable materials/energy sources – see analysis elsewhere at paragraphs 102 to 107;
 - Ensure that environmental impacts are taken *fully* into account in [Pykett Inquiry CRL outcomes] investment decisions.
- 2.35
 - Improve the [Pykett Inquiry CRL outcomes Deemed] planning framework in a way which recognises [the sterling contribution of SAWTAG herewith and] the interactions between [Croxley Green, presently divided, and Watford General rail] transport modes; land use [especially in the Protected Green Belt] and economic development, and provides for a more stable, integrated and strategic [as represented] background within which [London Overground – LO, London Underground Limited [LUL] transport operators and others [such as the Pykett Inquiry inspired by SAWTAG] may make decisions; - see also analysis elsewhere at
- 2.45
 - Produce better [rail] public transport [as advocated herewith by SAWTAG]
 - Enhance [rail] public transport networks –see both 1.33 (BOX) and analysis elsewhere at
 - Give the [SAWTAG] passenger a bigger voice in [Pykett Inquiry] public transport [proceedings]
- 2.49
 - We (the previous Government) are committed to making the fullest possible use of new technologies [such as non-carbon renewable hydro-electric Power, especially in the leats etc associated with Historic mills] to deliver the [ITWP] New Deal for Transport.
- 2.52
 - Challenging targets are helping to focus attention on reducing greenhouse gas emissions [See 1.34, 1.36, 2.12, & 2.25] improving local air quality, and boosting rail freight [ie: on the WCML and its advocated loops herewith]. There is also the Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution (RCEP) paragraph 8.85 on greater hydro-power
- 3.26
 - With the [ITWP] *New Deal for Transport* there is POTENTIAL FOR A [Croxley Rail Link and

- 4.14
- Ensure that the [Croxley Rail Link and Watford] Railways are planned [in the Pykett Inquiry] and operated as a coherent network, not merely a [disconnected] collection of different [contending] franchises;
 - participate [in the Pykett Inquiry] actively in the development of regional [Green Belt] and local [Watford and District] land use planning policies, and ensure as far as possible that [Pykett Inquiry] decisions on the provision of [Croxley Rail Link] rail services dovetail with these [advocated improved] policies;
- Take a view on the capacity [particularly of the WCML with the options East and West of it set out herewith] of the railway, assess investment needs [with ITWP paragraphs 3.30, 3.31, & 4.29, and identify priorities where operators aspirations may conflict [like the 1912 Act of Parliament in which the Metropolitan could not break the LNWR Watford Fiefdom, and the former could not reach the centre of Watford, let alone St Albans] with one another.

- 109 Please note finally that ITWP 4.165 is applicable. This may be achieved by linking the above ITWP 2.20 on regeneration, with the commentary elsewhere on ITWP 4.165 for water transport.
- 110 Secondly a brief description will be given for the justification of the Croxley Rail Link amended proposal advocated here, in the Green Belt. The amendment to the TWA proposals moves the Croxley Green viaduct westwards, connecting by a 'S' shaped curve to the Met. End of the viaduct. There is, of course, also the regenerated Croxley Green Station, with an island platform, on the old footprint of the 1907 Act of Parliament Lands there.
- 111 This saves much land in the Green Belt and please see above, in **TWO**, ITWP paragraph 2.25 at the second given. The island platform double-ended Croxley Green Station; with access at the canal/River Gade eastern end and from Ascot Road will save a whole expensive station at Ascot Road. There will still be an entrance very close by Ascot Road as advocated. Some of the car parking will be moved under the shortened viaduct.
- 112 Similarly, the viaduct will be significantly shortened in length, so the whole area will be many millions of pounds cheaper by utilising the TWA alternative. Readers are directed to the additional information elsewhere in these Reports. Finally note the Green Belt situation and protection sets in train the architectural recreation of Cassiobury House Frontages, as the elevations of the power station there. Both Green Belt protection and such sustainable development there figured heavily in the NPPF.

THREE – ALTERNATIVES

- 113 In view of the severe constraints of time and resources, the favoured alternative in the TWA procedures of the Pykett Inquiry is set out briefly.
- 114 The SAWTAG alternative has been searched for diligently, especially in the Alternatives Review (pages 1 to 36) but does not appear anywhere.
- 115 The favoured alternative is all encompassing and includes:
A shorter Croxley viaduct,
Croxley Green Station resited to its 1907 Act of Parliament location,
Watford West Station resited similarly,
A new single track loop station at Watford Stadium, with new connections,
Restoring the chord and service between Bushey and Oxhey, via Watford Stadium, that allowed direct trains from London to Croxley Green.
Forming a new junction between the 1862 Rickmansworth Branch and the Metropolitan/Chiltern main lines at Croxley Hall,
Retaining full service to Watford Met Station by a split service as recommended by London Travelwatch. SAWTAG back a split service through portion working; of future Crossrail Trains.
- 116 Perusing the Alternatives Review at page 35 reveals a Crossrail Scenario Initial Predictions (2002) of the Old Crossrail Option. The 1994 Crossrail required electrification of the Aylesbury Chiltern Line, and Crossrail trains both there, and potentially to Watford on the WCML.
- 117 Although the 2008 Crossrail Act went to Heathrow and almost to Reading Instead; the corridor studies associated with the future of HS-2 and the WCML (See elsewhere in this report), again suggest a Crossrail Link from west of Paddington of half a mile to the WCML, to ease Euston congestion.
- 118 If this eventuates then Crossrail Trains will run from Central London to Watford of 10 coaches. SAWTAG envisage the Pykett Inquiry will heed requests that Crossrail Trains at Watford will divide (split) and thence serve Watford Met by reversal.
- 119 Four coaches will serve St Albans, and hopefully onwards, and six coaches will reverse at Watford Junction to serve Aylesbury. Two coaches will reverse again at Croxley Green to serve Watford Met. Heathrow Express trains demonstrate suitable automatic couplings.
- 120 Returning to the Alternatives Review besides presaging Crossrail to Croxley Green, there are further useful options,
- 121 Alternative 2 retains Watford Met Station,
- 122 Alternative 3 gives a shuttle to Watford Met, if not a Crossrail shuttle; as is set in train here.
- 123 Alternative 4 gives a junction at Croxley Moor from the 1862 Rickmansworth Branch to the Metropolitan/Chiltern main line. There is also an Act of Parliament of 1873 for this (see Alan A Jackson – London’s Metropolitan Railway page 77).

- 124 Alternative 7 gives a service towards Aylesbury; where SAWTAG suggest Aylesbury Crossrail portion/split working instead.
- 125 Alternative 8 examines a central tunnel for CRL under Watford; where SAWTAG suggest a power adjunct to this to fulfil the UK's future climate change obligations.
- 126 Returning to the ITWP at paragraph 4.195 to 4.203.
- 127 4.195 "We (the previous Government) are developing a new approach to the appraisal to [Croxley Rail Link] transport problems. This is designed to draw together the large amount of [Pykett Inquiry] information collected as part of the appraisal of a [Croxley Rail Link] transport problem and [SAWTAG's] alternative solutions.
- 128 It looks at the contribution of [rail] different forms of transport [such as loops east and west of the WCML as advocated; co-ordinated hydro-electric power, water transport and tunnelling and a single-track small loop directly serving Watford Stadium] in developing [SAWTAG'S] alternative solutions, and the potential effect of the new integrated [now sustainable development in the NPPF] transport approach. It is our [previous Government] intention that this new approach will be applied to the appraisal of all [including the Croxley Rail Link] transport projects."
- 129 4.199 "Because of the potential environmental impacts of major new construction, [such as the Croxley Rail Link viaduct] it is important [in the Pykett Inquiry] that *alternatives* to [Croxley viaduct] new construction are considered at the earliest stages [both in the Pykett Inquiry generally and the TWA order] of planning. *Alternatives* include making better use [as is advocated generally of old railway alignments] of existing [and disused rail] infrastructure, and the use of [as advocated for broad rail] other forms of transport."
- 130 4.201 "**For all [including the Green Belt Croxley Viaduct] environmentally sensitive areas or sites, there will be a strong presumption against new [Croxley viaduct] or expanded transport infrastructure, which would significantly affect such sites or important habitats or landscapes.**"
- 131 Such proposals [Croxley viaduct] will be assessed [in the Pykett Inquiry] in relation to the [high] status and purpose of the [Green Belt] site ... and the scope for [alternative] mitigation.
- 132 A transport scheme [such as the Croxley Rail Link] which would significantly affect [both the Metropolitan Green Belt and the River Gade, in the setting of the Chiltern AONB] sensitive site, landscape, should not go ahead [in the form of the new concrete viaduct] unless there is no other better option [there is – SAWTAG's] and all reasonable steps have been taken to mitigate the impact. Each case, [here the viaduct] will be determined [by Inspector Pykett] on its merits, taking account of the following questions:

- how important is the [viaduct] site?
- how serious is the [viaduct] likely impact?
- are the alternatives [there is – SAWTAG’s] which avoid the impact?
- would the alternatives serve the purpose and at a reasonable [half the] cost?
- if not, are mitigation [by HCC/TfL] or compensatory measures feasible? Are they likely to be successful? Are the costs reasonable in the circumstances?

133 4.203 Some area [and] sites [such as the viaduct] may be irreplaceable, [as regards the Green Belt, River Gade in the setting of the Chilterns AONB and the Grand Union Canal], and *that* will have a particular [great] weight in the [Pykett Inquiry] assessment. These principles *will be applied* to all forms of transport development [such as the viaduct] which affect [the above] sensitive areas.