

12.1.9. Suggestion that the ventilation shaft is moved closer to the National Rail lines

We are considering this proposal; although this would remove the ventilation shaft from the eastern edge of Wandsworth Common, it is expected to trigger the need for an additional shaft which would need to be located in the densely residential area known as 'between the Commons' .

12.1.10. Suggestion that the ventilation shaft should be moved to Clapham Common

We have considered a ventilation shaft on Clapham Common in response to the consultation feedback. To achieve this, the alignment of the station at Clapham Junction would need to be changed and this is not something we support because it would require us to change the worksites to less suitable locations. An alignment via Tooting instead of Balham would negate the need for a shaft on Wandsworth Common.

12.1.11. Suggestion that construction works associated with the Springfield ventilation shaft should be linked to the current site developments to minimise disruption

We are working closely with the Springfield Hospital Development Project to coordinate work so both projects can reduce the impact on the community.

12.2. Wimbledon

12.2.1. Concern over disruption to Wimbledon town centre during construction

During the consultation, respondents raised concerns about the impact of the current proposals on Wimbledon town centre. In particular, respondents were concerned about the potential number of buildings that we may need to acquire in order to build the railway, the ability to access and enjoy the town centre, including Centre Court shopping centre, during construction and the number of business and jobs that would be temporarily or permanently relocated.

A station at Wimbledon is important to transform travel in the region. However like all big infrastructure projects it will be a challenge to plan and build.

To deliver a working Crossrail 2 railway and station at Wimbledon there are a number of requirements. These include the need for four dedicated Crossrail 2 platforms to support a high frequency service; an easy passenger interchange with the existing railway, particularly with South West Trains stopping services; space for trains to turn around to allow up to 10 Crossrail 2 trains per hour to begin at Wimbledon and another 20 to continue on to the existing South West Main Line; a depot that can be easily accessed by trains ready to begin or terminate services at Wimbledon and construction plans that would minimise disruption for passengers using existing rail and Tube services.

The proposal presented in the 2015 consultation met these operational requirements. Whilst we were at the early stages of design and detailed planning is still to be undertaken, we believe that the construction work required for this proposal could be phased to help minimise disruption to the town centre.

However, a number of alternative suggestions were put forward in the consultation, including tunnelling the South West Main Line non-stopping services, reconfiguring the existing station layout and considering the use of fewer and narrower platforms. We are carefully considering each of these and whilst they may solve some of the issues, they may also create other problems, including increasing overall land size impacted, extending construction times by several years and slowing down journey times and/or reducing train frequencies. However, in response to consultation feedback, we are working hard to fully understand potential alternative solutions, and weigh the pros and cons of these against the existing proposals.

We are continuing to analyse a number of ideas, including those put forward in the consultation, to develop a design that minimises disruption for people that live, work, visit and travel through Wimbledon town centre, while allowing us to build and operate Crossrail 2. The results of these investigations will inform a decision on a preferred station location, which would be subject to further consultation.

12.2.2. **Specific suggestions – tunnel South West Mail Line**

Whilst tunnelling the South West Main Line non-stopping services could free up platform space for Crossrail 2 at Wimbledon station, our analysis to date shows it would create several other significant issues, including increasing cost considerably and increasing the time taken to build Crossrail 2 by two to three years. Building another tunnel would also require the acquisition of land in other parts of London in order to build additional tunnel portals and ventilation shafts. Depending on the construction method used, this land take could be greater than the current proposals.

12.2.3. **Specific suggestions – reconfigure station**

Several responses referred to options involving reconfiguring the existing station, including consideration of a multi-level station. Our analysis to date shows that reconfiguring the existing station to make space for Crossrail 2 would still require significant land take to the North or South of the station. It may also increase the time taken to build Crossrail by approximately two years, and create considerable operational concerns. The use of fewer and/or narrower Crossrail 2 platforms may reduce the land take requirements in the town centre but could impact on our ability to deliver a reliable and high-capacity train service, compromising the benefits of the whole scheme and meaning slower, less frequent journeys for everyone.

No decision on station options has been made at this stage. We are working with the London Borough of Merton to consider the short, medium and long-term economic impacts of constructing a station at Wimbledon, and identifying how our proposals could integrate with local aspirations in line with their 'Future Wimbledon' master planning work. This, along with further engineering work, will enable us to compare the likely impacts and benefits of each station option, which will inform a decision before the next period of public consultation.

12.2.4. **Concern over demolition to Centre Court shopping centre**

Centre Court shopping centre is currently identified as one of the worksites we need to construct Crossrail 2. Our initial assessments suggest that we may be able to retain around half of Centre Court and options are being considered to reinstate the rest of the site before the station opens in 2030. As part of our design process we are exploring options to minimise the impact of construction as much as possible. Construction at Wimbledon would also be phased over a number of years for this reason. Opportunities for over-station development following the completion of the new station would need to be approved in line with local and London-wide planning policies.

12.2.5. **Concern that only one option has been proposed within Wimbledon plans**

Prior to the 2015 consultation, we considered a range of alternative proposals, but these did not meet our engineering and operational requirements. All options we have explored have varying levels of overall impacts, and we have a duty as a transport authority to develop proposals that best meet the requirements of the railway, respond to the future transport needs of London and can be built without unacceptable impacts. Where an option does not meet these criteria, it is not helpful to put it before the public as if it did.

All of our proposals are at a formative stage; no decisions have been made or outcomes pre-determined. Feedback through consultation helps us understand where improvements need to be made. We want people to raise their concerns with it and tell us their priorities so that we can incorporate them into our designs as the scheme progresses.

In response to this feedback in the consultation, we have developed a supplementary information sheet [Options for a Crossrail 2 station at Wimbledon](#).

12.2.6. **Suggestion for additional entrances/exits**

Crossrail 2 would lead to a large increase in the number of passengers using Wimbledon station. As part of the current proposals, the existing station concourse would be re-built to make it substantially bigger. We also proposed an additional entrance on Queen's Road. In response to this suggestion, as we investigate options for constructing Crossrail 2 at Wimbledon, we will look at the opportunity to provide alternative and additional entrances/exits to improve the permeability and flow throughout the station and Wimbledon town centre.

12.2.7. **Suggestion that the station should be below ground, with an extended tunnel constructed between Wimbledon and Raynes Park**

We had considered this option prior to consultation. Our initial assessment suggested that it would still require large surface worksites in Wimbledon town centre in order to construct the deep station and ventilation shafts. Based on our initial assessment, sites B, C, E and part of site F identified in [Factsheet S13: Wimbledon](#) (containing Wimbledon Bridge House, commercial properties around Broadway Place, the station entrance and ticket hall, Everyday Church, Queens Court Care Home and Quadrangle Lodge) would still be required. In addition to these, a tunnel portal farther south of Wimbledon station would require substantial residential land take. For these reasons, we did not progress this option in the last consultation.

However, in response to feedback from consultation, we are undertaking further work to fully understand all of the impacts and worksites required for providing a deep tunnelled Crossrail 2 station at Wimbledon.

12.2.8. Providing two branches between Wimbledon and Clapham Junction; one branch serving Earlsfield and a second serving Balham, Tooting, St Georges and Haydons Road (also known as the SWIRL – MAX proposal)

This suggestion is not being investigated further because it would compromise our objective to provide relief to the Northern line. Providing two branches in the central operating section of the route would result in Crossrail 2 serving the vital interchange at either Balham or Tooting Broadway much less frequently than the Northern line would. This would make interchange less attractive: for example, if the Northern line is departing a station every 2 or 3 minutes but Crossrail 2 is only departing every 6 minutes, travellers are far less likely to transfer from the Northern line onto Crossrail 2, or begin their journey at this station on Crossrail 2.

Also the addition of two junctions and four stations to the scheme would increase the cost of the scheme significantly and would limit our ability to offer a robust 30 trains per hour service between Wimbledon and Dalston in peak periods. This could mean we would need to operate fewer trains, reducing the benefits to people across the tunnelled section of the route.

12.2.9. Concern that serving a station that interchanges with the Northern line will not reduce congestion on the Northern line

Our transport modelling shows that Northern line passengers at either Balham or Tooting Broadway would travel to the West End using Crossrail 2 because it would have capacity and quicker journey times. Also many Northern line (City branch) passengers could find using a combination of the Elizabeth line and Crossrail 2 (interchanging at Tottenham Court Road) provides quicker and more convenient journeys to Farringdon, Moorgate, Liverpool Street and Canary Wharf.

To predict how people would move through the network with the introduction of Crossrail 2, we use an extensive range of data held within TfL and the GLA, built from surveys of millions of individual trips over several years. Our analysis also takes into account journey times, crowding, difficulty of interchange, and forecasts for housing development and economic/employment growth areas to fully understand passenger flows throughout the network with the introduction of Crossrail 2.

12.2.10. Suggestion that a tunnel portal at Gap road should be discrete and unobtrusive

We have tried to locate the tunnel portal away from residential properties, in order to minimise disruption during construction. The site at Gap Road would allow Crossrail 2 to serve stations on the various National Rail branches, while avoiding direct impact on residential properties.

Further design work is being carried out to determine the requirements at the proposed portal location and we will draw on knowledge gained from other schemes for how they can be designed sympathetically to the local area. As the Crossrail 2 proposals develop further, we will engage with the relevant local authority, interested stakeholders and local community to inform the designs for portal.

12.2.11. Concern about the availability of space in locating a depot at Weir Road

We believe the Weir Road site would have sufficient space to provide “stabling” (i.e. parking) for trains, with facilities for train washing and cleaning), as well as a depot for maintaining these trains and a shaft providing ventilation and emergency access to the tunnels. The site would also support Crossrail 2 tunnelling works. Further work is under way to work out the best layout for the Weir Road site. In addition, we are still also considering various alternative sites.

12.2.12. Concern that a depot at Weir Road would negatively impact local businesses

From an operational point of view, our preferred site would be located on the Weir Road industrial estate. This site would be close to the Crossrail 2 southern hub at Wimbledon, allowing trains to enter and leave service promptly. It would also provide access to the South West Main Line, to assist with construction logistics. Further work is under way to consider various alternative sites. We are engaging with local businesses and will continue to do so should we require this site.

12.2.13. Concern about the chosen location for the turn-back and dive-under facilities at Dundonald Road

We have tried to locate this worksite away from residential properties, in order to minimise disruption during construction. The proposed site would allow Crossrail 2 to serve stations on the various South West Main Line branches, whilst avoiding direct impact on residential properties.

13. Issues specific to the South West branches

13.1. Raynes Park, New Malden and Motspur Park

13.1.1. **Suggestion that existing stations, particularly Raynes Park, should be upgraded**

Raynes Park and New Malden stations will require work to accommodate the new infrastructure, improve passenger circulation and help improve interchange between services. This could include installing additional platforms and lengthening or straightening existing ones, as well as changes to signalling and other station improvements. More detail on proposals for these stations will be available at the next phase of consultation.

13.1.2. **Concerns that not enough information about the location of new track was provided to be properly consulted about proposals in this area.**

During the last phase of consultation our proposals for the regional branches of Crossrail 2 were at a very early stage of development. We know that in order to create the extra capacity needed to run new Crossrail 2 services on the existing railway network south west of Wimbledon, we will need to install some new track between Wimbledon and New Malden stations, but at the last phase of consultation the work to develop detailed plans for the new tracks had not yet been started.

During the next phase of consultation our plans will be further developed and we will be able to share more detailed proposals with stakeholders and the community in this area.

13.1.3. **Concerns about the impact increased train frequencies will have on houses facing the railway in this area.**

Requirements in the UK for controlling noise impacts from new projects are becoming ever stricter. To make sure we comply with these, we have published a *noise policy* which clearly sets out how noise impacts are defined and how we plan to control them. This policy builds upon the standards adopted for previous projects such as Crossrail 1 and the Northern line extension (NLE). In addition to this and as part of the EIA, a full assessment of the potential noise impacts of construction and operation of the scheme will help to develop the mitigation proposals.

An assessment of noise impacts along the surface sections of railway will also undertaken. This will rely on a programme of baseline noise surveys that will help us determine how any changes in train service frequency may alter overall noise levels. Where significant effects are predicted the potential for providing mitigation, such as noise barriers, will be determined.

13.1.4. Concerns that construction of the new railway will have a negative impact on local people

Crossrail 2 would be held to a Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which would set out working practices for managing the construction impacts of Crossrail 2. The CoCP would focus on the environmental, public health and safety aspects of the scheme that may affect the surroundings in the vicinity of the proposed construction sites.

As far as possible, construction activity would be planned to minimise disruption to residents and businesses in the local area. Our engineers are currently examining the potential impacts and developing measures to minimise disruption as much as practicable. We would seek to apply best practice as developed on Crossrail 1 and other comparable schemes, which has been very successful in minimising noise and disturbance at work sites. Construction work would be contained within securely fenced and hoarded worksites, contractors would have to adhere to considerate construction practices and use best available techniques to reduce noise and disruption.

Working practices for contractors would be agreed with the local authority to ensure disruption to local residents is minimised. Appropriate local forums would be established in due course for sharing information and collecting feedback.

13.2. Removal of Level Crossings on West Barnes Lane and Elm Road

13.2.1. Suggestion that replacement should be a bridge or underpass, not a diversion around the railway

The proposed increase to the frequency of train services with Crossrail 2 will make it impractical to retain a small number of level crossings in the local area. The level crossings that will be affected are at Elm Road, West Barnes Lane and Motspur Park. We will need to remove these crossings to improve safety and reliability, and to reduce risk to users and rail passengers. The removal of crossings would also help to improve local road connectivity and reduce delays to road users.

We will work closely with local communities and the local authority to find an appropriate resolution for each crossing. Access across the railway may be provided by a new bridge or an underpass, or via a diversion to another crossing point.

The access requirements of all users of the local level crossings will inform what we next consult on.

We are still at an early stage in the development of our proposals for Crossrail 2. Our assessment of the work we need to do at level crossings will inform what we next consult on.

13.2.2. Concern about the increase in traffic congestion if the level crossings are closed

Traffic modelling is helping to inform the option development process, and we are working closely with local councils, highway authorities and TfL to develop optimised solutions for each level crossing.

More detail on the emerging proposals for each level crossing will be available during the next phase of consultation, and members of the community and stakeholders will be able to provide feedback and let us know any concerns that they may have about potential impacts to local roads.

The EIA will include a Transport Assessment that will assess any potential impacts on local road networks as a result of any level crossing closures. The results of this assessment will be reported on in the environmental statement, along with any appropriate recommended mitigation measures, which will form part of the hybrid bill application.

13.2.3. Concerns about disruption to local residents and businesses caused by alternatives to the level crossings

We are working closely with local councils, highways authorities and TfL to develop the most suitable options for each level crossing.

The EIA will assess any potential impacts on the local areas, both during the construction and operation of the new railway, as a result of any level crossing closures. The results of this assessment will be reported on in the environmental statement, along with any appropriate recommended mitigation measures, which will form part of the hybrid bill application.

Careful construction planning will also consider disruption to the local areas during construction, and identify any mitigation measures where possible.

More detail on the emerging proposals for each level crossing will be available during the next phase of consultation, and members of the community and stakeholders will be able to provide feedback and let us know any concerns that they may have about potential impacts on the local areas

13.2.4. Emergency services should not be disrupted by the removal of any level crossings

Retaining access for emergency vehicles is a key priority. We will be consulting with the emergency services throughout the development of our proposals for the alternatives to level crossings in this area.

13.3. Between Epsom and Worcester Park

13.3.1. Suggestion that Oyster should be extended to all stations on the branch line

It is anticipated that whatever TfL fares and ticketing structure is in place when Crossrail 2 opens, these will apply across the proposed scheme.

13.3.2. Concern about the proposed capacity and frequency of services not being sufficient

In most cases, Crossrail 2 will provide a more frequent train service on the branches of the national rail network than the current train service, representing up to a doubling of the current train service frequency in some cases. In addition, the proposed Crossrail 2 rolling stock will be configured internally to carry a very high volume of passengers; the number of passengers carried by each train will be nearly twice that carried by existing underground trains.

The combination of increased frequency and capacity of trains is sufficient to meet the level of demand forecast.

On the Epsom branch some Waterloo services would be retained, but at a reduced frequency compared to today. There would be capacity for total of 8 trains per hour, in each direction into central London, representing an increase of 2 trains per hour in peak hours compared to today. This would be a combination of Waterloo and new Crossrail 2 services, with a minimum of four Crossrail 2 trains per hour calling at all stations.

Direct services to Waterloo from Ashted, Leatherhead and beyond would be retained. In addition, existing services from Epsom (and beyond) via Sutton to Victoria and London Bridge would also be retained.